



Class LB 875

Book , B8

Copyright N^o

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

GOVERNMENT BY INFLUENCE

AND OTHER ADDRESSES

By the Same Author

THE MAKING OF OUR MIDDLE
SCHOOLS. An Account of the
Development of Secondary Edu-
cation in the United States.

Crown 8vo. \$3.00

GOVERNMENT BY INFLUENCE

AND

OTHER ADDRESSES

BY

ELMER ELLSWORTH BROWN

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION OF THE
UNITED STATES

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK

LONDON, BOMBAY AND CALCUTTA

1910

LB875
B8

~~L-B4/1~~
B87

COPYRIGHT, 1910
By LONGMANS, GREEN, AND Co.



THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE, U. S. A.

©CL A 259479

TO
JAMES BURRILL ANGELL

NOTE

THE addresses included in this volume were delivered on various occasions during the first three years of my service in the Bureau of Education. Those of the number which have already appeared in print have been scattered through various publications, some of them of limited circulation, and it is safe to assume that there are not a dozen persons any one of whom has seen more than two or three of the whole collection. For permission to reprint in this form, acknowledgment is made to the publishers of those periodicals in which certain of the addresses were first published. The names of publications in which any of them have hitherto appeared are mentioned under their several titles. Alterations have been freely made in the text and considerable portions have been rewritten for this volume. Occasional repetitions have, however, been purposely retained.

E. E. B.

WASHINGTON, August 26, 1909.

CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | PAGE |
|---|------|
| I. GOVERNMENT BY INFLUENCE | 1 |
| II. THE SELF-RESPECT OF CITIES | 25 |
| III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION | 43 |
| IV. SOME RELATIONS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND SECULAR EDUCATION | 61 |
| V. THE CULTURE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS | 75 |
| VI. THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE MOVEMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION | 97 |
| VII. POSSIBLE CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES | 111 |
| VIII. ARE WE AN INVENTIVE PEOPLE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION? | 119 |
| IX. CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES: SOME OF THEIR NEEDS | 145 |
| X. TRAINING FOR MOTHER-WORK | 167 |
| XI. THE WORK OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS IN EDUCATION | 185 |
| XII. THE DISTINCTIVE FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITY AND NORMAL SCHOOL IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS | 197 |
| XIII. INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL INTEREST | 209 |
| XIV. THE ART OF THE TEACHER | 219 |

I

GOVERNMENT BY INFLUENCE

An Address delivered at the Commencement Exercises of the University of West Virginia, June 17, 1908, and at the University Day Exercises of the University of North Carolina, October 12, 1908. Published in part in the University of North Carolina Record, October, 1908.

I

GOVERNMENT BY INFLUENCE

THE subject of which I am to speak is suggested by a saying of George Washington, which may be found in one of his letters to Henry Lee, written in 1786. The correspondence had to do with "the present tumults in Massachusetts," referring doubtless to what is known as Shays' rebellion. Lee had urged that the influence of the Congress be brought to bear, with a view to ending the outbreak, and Washington replied, "Influence is not government."

This saying went to the heart of the difficulty under which the new states of that time were laboring. It was the "critical period" in the history of the country. Independence had been won, and nationality had not yet been achieved. The Congress had no power. It could exercise an influence and nothing more, when the only hope for peace lay in authority, with force at its command. But that critical time was abnormal and could not last. The saying of Washington is true for all time if we take it to mean that

influence where there is no authority is not government. What I shall endeavor to show is that under ordinary conditions the power of government, in steadily increasing measure, is to be exerted in the form of influence and not of force, and that government by influence is one of the chief concerns of modern education.

A generation after Washington wrote this letter, Daniel Webster was a member of the constitutional convention of Massachusetts. In the course of one of the debates of that body he turned to the subject of taxation for the support of schools, and thereupon made use of the following words: "This commonwealth, with other of the New England states, early adopted, and has constantly maintained the principle, that it is the undoubted right, and the bounden duty of government, to provide for the instruction of all youth. . . . We regard it as a wise and liberal system of police, by which property, and life, and the peace of society are secured. . . . We hope to excite a feeling of respectability, and a sense of character, by enlarging the capacity, and increasing the sphere of intellectual enjoyment. By general instruction, we seek, as far as possible, to purify the whole moral atmosphere; to keep good sentiments uppermost, and to turn the strong current of feeling and opinion, as well as the censures of the law, and the denunciations of religion, against immorality and crime. We

hope for a security, beyond the law, and above the law, in the prevalence of 'enlightened and well principled moral sentiment.'"

We have here the doctrine stated in the clearest language and in its lowest terms. It is easier, cheaper, and better to keep order by making men moral and self-governing than by maintaining more guardians of the peace. This is the doctrine in its lowest terms, for it takes account only of the police function of government and of education only as forming law-abiding citizens. But if influence is the better part of the power of the police, then in an enlightened state, when we come into the wider ranges of governmental activity, influence must play a still larger part and force a relatively lessening part. Government by influence, in other words, is destined to be a generally prevailing mode of government.

We are proceeding here on the assumption that governments aim to further self-government. A central government does its best work when it does most to promote local self-government of a really effective kind. Local government does its best when it promotes individual self-government among its citizens. This is not to say that the best government is that which governs least. Freedom and rule are not the opposite ends of a see-saw, one going up whenever the other goes down. The more a good

government does, the more freedom there is, through increase of moral and intelligent self-control. But it is not self-government alone which is an end of government. The end is a co-operative self-government. It is not enough that men be made free, as regards external constraint, but that as free men they shall work together for common ends. Through such free co-operation the empty principle of liberty acquires a moral content. To get together and work together, not through compulsion from without but through an inner purpose and conviction — that is a consummation which men are seeking in our time, and government itself is one great means to that end.

We have recently seen a striking example of this newer political ideal, in the conference of governors at Washington. That gathering is a thing to be pondered, from many points of view. Just on the eve of a great political contest, a President who is himself a consummate party leader and who stands for the most advanced federalism of our time, called into conference the governors of all of the states and territories, for a discussion of questions affecting the general welfare. The response was as frank and unreserved as was the invitation. All who could be present, nine-tenths of the whole number, were there. On all hands it was understood that the purpose was not to subordinate the

states but rather to quicken their activity in ways in which the states could work together. The representatives of the states not only carried out their part of the program, but on their own account went forward into new arrangements for future co-operation. And so that most difficult thing in political history was accomplished, a positive advance, in which the balance between the parts and the whole, between individuals and their society, was held to its true level. Here is not only government by influence, but the fruit of long years of government by influence.

The terms which we are using may be employed in different meanings, and a little more of precision is desirable at this point. After I had in all innocence chosen the title for this address, I came upon exactly the same expression used to describe some of the worst tendencies of our political life. Influence is a thing not unknown in the baser forms of politics, but in such use the accent is often transferred to the penultimate syllable. Government by influence finds its deadly opposite in government by "*influence*."

What we are now considering is the organized, permanent, and coherent influence embodied in the institutions of education. Public libraries and great academies of science and the arts have their part in its exercise, but we can speak here of only common schools and universities; and since equal attention cannot be devoted to both

in our one short hour, we must, in this university gathering, consider chiefly the university side of the matter.

But it is not to be forgotten that, in this country, schools and universities have been welded into one system and their influence is one influence. In our striving after universal education, the university and the primary school represent the two poles of universality. The school is for all of the people, but can teach only a small part of human knowledge. The university is for all of the sciences, though only a portion of our people can come under its direct influence. But the university unfolds the general scheme of knowledge and investigates the principles of selection by which the scope of instruction in the elementary schools is defined. On the other hand, the training and the ideals of schools of the earlier grades, elementary and secondary, are the groundwork of instruction in the universities; and the needs of those schools have somewhat to do with the arrangement of university courses, since the schools are the channels through which the good things that universities have to offer are chiefly spread abroad. We cannot too strongly emphasize this solidarity of our various teaching institutions, for it is one of the surest guarantees of our essential democracy.

There is, moreover, one aspect of elementary

education which must be noted in passing. The primary school as a moral agency broadens out into special schools for wayward children and the new activities of the juvenile court. Through the juvenile court and the public sentiment which has brought that court into being, the educational purpose is gradually spreading through our whole criminal jurisprudence. We do not give over the punishment of wrongdoers, for a government that does not punish in case of need is no government at all. But we are learning that in many instances society has more to gain from the moral education of the criminal than from his punishment, and we have come to prefer education to vengeance wherever it can be made to yield a better return. The modification of our penal practice by educational aims and methods is accordingly one of the notable developments of the modern system of government.

It is a change in the direction of government by influence. The state seeks, as rapidly as possible, to replace external compulsion by internal self-control on the part of its citizens. Purposes consistent with the common good, sustained by knowledge of the meaning of those purposes, and brought within the sphere of hope by the trained intelligence and will which make them possible of attainment — these are to replace the rule of force as fast as human nature

shall render such a change practicable. "Final causes" by little and little are to supplant "efficient causes" in our political relations. No one but an enthusiast or a doctrinaire could expect government in its entirety to be so transformed, short of a millennium too remote to give us much concern in present-day politics. But the most practical of politicians cannot overlook the fact that modern states are committed to the program of a steady expansion of government in the form of education, involving as it must a relative lessening of government in the form of force. Herein lies, more particularly, the program of modern democracy.

If this brief glance at elementary education has helped to a clearing-up of our terms, we may get some hint of the wide range of this mode of government in a consideration of the university, as the most advanced and mature of its organs. Here again we must limit ourselves to a very few representative instances, having in mind particularly the service rendered by state universities.

Governors and legislatures now turn ordinarily and naturally to their state universities for competent information and opinion on a great variety of subjects. Within the past decade particularly we have seen this governmental habit taking root. In one state during a recent session of the legislature more than a score of important bills

were submitted by the governor and by legislative committees to different departments of the university of the state, for expert advice as to certain of their scientific bearings. In another state advice is freely taken at the university with reference to the statutory form of all measures of special importance, and the state commissions which discharge some of the most important functions of government are organized in close touch with those departments of the university in which the best knowledge of the subjects under consideration is to be found. In still another state the examination of agricultural fertilizers, and other administrative responsibilities of large practical importance, are devolved upon the agricultural college and the university. This is but a small indication of the extent which the practice has already attained, a practice which largely affects institutions on a private as well as those on a public foundation. It is impartial publicity, especially in the form of scientific information, that is especially expected from the universities. At their best estate, in furthering such impartial publicity they are lending a new character, a new and peculiar dignity, to the government of our states. They are working with the steadfast stars that in their courses fight for righteousness.

Of the countless ways in which such influence makes for better things, let me mention here but two :

In the first place, the increase of statistical knowledge and of interest in statistics is having one result that could hardly have been foreseen. Numerical statements become significant only through comparison. But when comparison is made between the statistics of different municipalities or institutions or corporations, it is commonly found that they represent such diverse methods of recording and reporting facts that they are in reality incommensurable. The immediate outcome of such a discovery is not infrequently irritation and a misuse of strong language. An old proverb which declares the truthfulness of figures and brings them into patriotic association with the boyhood of George Washington, comes in for its share of satirical abuse. But this is all on the way to something better. Those who care to know the truth have more allies than those who would misrepresent or conceal the truth. The steady pressure of a demand for figures that can be compared begins after a time to affect the systems of accounting from which such figures are to be drawn. Under modern business methods an improved system of accounting is a key to the betterment of business processes and a key also to that publicity which is the ground of a good understanding between a given concern and its constituency. The statistical report affects the accounting, improved accounting benefits the

business accounted for, and together they bring the better business into better relations with the people whom it serves. So a scientific report becomes the mild influence through which a real reform is accomplished; and if the thing reformed should chance to be some branch of the public or semi-public service, in which the commonwealth is vitally concerned, we find that a result of really governmental dimensions has been accomplished.

An illustration might be drawn from the later work of the Interstate Commerce Commission. The services of the statistician of that body in devising improved forms for accounting in the transportation systems concerned, which may serve as a basis for more nearly uniform and comparable reports, marks an important advance not only in the work of the Commission but also in the internal administration of all American railroads. Of like significance is the activity in recent years of the National Census Office, in promoting greater uniformity and precision in the fiscal accounts and reports of American municipalities.

Let us turn now to a very different aspect of government. The form in which any piece of legislation is cast is oftentimes a question of chief concern. A policy which has won out overwhelmingly at the polls may fail at last or be too long delayed because of the neglect to

embody it in a measure which can stand the test of constitutionality. This is a test which may not be applied till the law has gone into effect, and usually not until the legislature which passed the law has been succeeded by another, or by two or three or more. This is so in the nature of things. It is not to be expected that a court should pass upon a constitutional question when it has no case before it and no argument of counsel *pro* and *con*. Yet much more can, undoubtedly, be done than is customarily done, out of court, in the way of a preliminary examination of given measures with reference to the constitutional questions involved.

A variety of other questions may properly enter into such preliminary scrutiny: the relation of the new act to preceding acts, the enumeration of acts and parts of acts which it repeals, and all of those other points of finished legislation which even a layman can dimly apprehend, but which, in the presence of lawyers, legislators, and jurists, it would embarrass him to enumerate. There is a fair field here, it would seem, for faculties of law or university departments of politics and jurisprudence to do a work comparable with that which has been done for nearly forty years by the "Parliamentary Counsel to the Treasury" in Great Britain. And courts and legislatures and the people at large would benefit by such a service.

A preliminary scrutiny usurps none of the proper functions of legislatures and courts. Its influence, however, could hardly be limited absolutely to the form as distinguished from the substance of our laws. For such service, regularly organized, as it should be, and carried on through a series of years, must necessarily be more and more affected by studies in comparative legislation. The men engaged therein must come to see the growing need of certain practicable uniformities in the legislation of different states. Their advice in the more general questions of legislation, beyond the realm of partisan politics, must become increasingly valuable. Such procedure offers much to hope for in the improvement of our annual output of new laws, as regards their consistency, their constitutionality, and their workmanlike and workable character.

I have merely hinted in the briefest manner at two of the many ways in which organized influence as represented by the university is taking its place along with positive law and the power that enforces law in our modern systems of government. But this movement is not going forward without interruption or question. We must now take account of the fact that our legislative bodies in particular are commonly indisposed to turn over any of their ordinary functions to other men or bodies of men, who may

be designated as "experts." It is the policy of referring legislative questions to commissions whose members are not members of the legislature to which objection is made. The reluctance of our federal Congress to commit the framing of tariff schedules to a tariff commission is a case in point, and many others might be cited from our recent legislative history, both state and national.

I would say that, in the main, this attitude is clearly justified. It is the business of a legislature to enact legislation. The members are chosen by the people for this purpose. It would be shirking responsibility for them to delegate this function to others who have not been so chosen by the people. They are to interpret the will of the people, in the forms of positive law. They have the training and experience, or are at least in control of the machinery, which would enable them to ascertain the mind of the people upon any question of public policy, more accurately than it could be ascertained by any scholastic or scientific body. Theirs is accordingly a high calling, and it is a matter of general concern that their office should be regarded with respect and confidence.

But it becomes increasingly clear that every large political question has not only a side of will but also a side of knowledge. It is a necessity of good government that the will of the people, as-

certained by fair political processes, shall proceed on a firm basis of knowledge, ascertained by adequate scientific processes. A legislative body does not gain in public confidence when it insists upon employing bungling processes of its own for the ascertainment of the facts of any science, which a scientific body is equipped to ascertain without waste of effort and with all possible precision. In like manner, a scientific body, however competent in its own field, fails to command public confidence when it enters the field of partisan politics, and employs in a bungling way the processes of which successful politicians are masters. In either case, the trespasser upon another's field is only made ridiculous. But since science and politics manifestly must have more and more to do with each other in our modern life, it is of urgent importance that each should respect the functions and methods of the other, and that the organs of both, in their respective spheres, should command full public confidence.

It follows that, as scientific bodies which seek to secure legislation must entrust their cause to legislators and politicians who have won public confidence, so legislative bodies which require scientific information for any purpose may best turn to scientists of established competence to obtain such information.

This view is, I think, to be strongly emphasized; and equal emphasis is to be laid upon its

obvious corollary, that governments cannot be adequately served on their scientific side by sporadic and temporary commissions, constituted *ad hoc*. Those great and permanent public interests with which government has to do, require the service of permanent scientific bodies, as thoroughly grounded and tested by time and as impressive in their constitution and traditions as are the other organs of government. Much of the objection to special commissions arises from their transient and tentative character. It cannot be expected that legislatures will bind themselves to the practice and custom of referring scientific questions for scientific determination, except as established institutions, comparable with themselves in dignity and reputation, shall become the bearers of such responsibilities. The sciences, moreover, are so inwrought one with another, that isolated institutions, representing single branches of knowledge, cannot ordinarily serve these great ends. It is only the institution in which the various sciences are all cultivated, in their various relationships, which can fill this large place in our governmental system. Modern governments, in other words, have imperative need of the modern university. Nor is this an altogether new and modern need. It might easily be traced back to medieval precedents, without abatement of its new urgency under these modern conditions.

In the subjects to which it has given special attention, a state university should be peculiarly fitted to render such public service. Its libraries and laboratories have grown to meet the needs of passing years; its faculties contain men well seasoned in their several departments of knowledge, together with young men fresh from the best world-centers of instruction; it has its long-tested method and apparatus for the selection of competence and the detection of incompetence; it has long concerned itself with the wider interests of the state, economic, sociologic, and professional, and can readily turn its investigations toward new and related needs as they may arise; and its every department is reinforced in any undertaking by the organized whole of the institution, with its traditions of scientific excellence and of unselfish public service. Without political influence of a partisan kind and with little power to enforce any statutory requirements, the university may render the strongest possible support to other branches of government, by merely ascertaining and putting forth scientific information concerning things in which the state is vitally concerned.

It is not to be forgotten that what has been said of the scientific side of government applies equally to the side of the arts. It is greatly to be desired, and is, indeed, inevitable, that government in America shall concern itself more seri-

ously than it has hitherto with art as a public good and a public necessity; and that the fine arts shall find in our twentieth century universities as complete an academic organization and equipment as that which the nineteenth century has gained for the sciences of nature.

In view of the growing dependence of modern states upon science and the arts for the attainment of their political ends, it has been suggested of late that the institutions of education, with the university at their head, may fairly be regarded as a fourth branch of government, co-ordinate with the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches. The service which these institutions have to render is so distinctive and so indispensable that this characterization is not wide of the mark. Education is, indeed, both more and less than such a governmental power. It is less, in that it commands as yet only partial recognition as having any governmental character whatever. It is more, in that it underlies all government, and trains the citizens who are to make our governments whatever they may come to be. In certain particulars our American educational systems are more nearly analogous to the ecclesiastical establishment where church and state are united. Such comparisons, however, can serve for only a partial characterization of this most universal agency of modern civilization. But public policy in America, and doubtless in

other lands, would seem to demand at least so much as this, that there be secured to our schools and universities an adequacy of financial support, a deferential regard, and an independence of action within the limits of public responsibility, which shall be comparable with that accorded to any one of the ordinary branches of government.

While the responsibility for our American educational systems rests primarily with the states, it must be clear that the federal government cannot be indifferent nor inactive as regards these concerns, when education has to do with such fundamental interests of our national life. Generally speaking, the states have now advanced further than the nation in the employment of educational institutions as an arm of government. But the nation has gone further than the states in the equipment of special offices of scientific research. In state and nation alike, I am persuaded, the full value of the sciences for governmental purposes can be gained only by some form of academic organization. Scattered laboratories and libraries, the special investigations instituted from time to time, the labors of special inquirers, no matter how competent in their several fields — all of these things must be brought into some form of conscious and permanent coherence, if they are to do their proper work in our governmental scheme. They are so brought together here in your vigorous and rising univer-

sity. They must be so brought together in the capital of the nation, whether the resulting institution shall bear the name of university or any other worthy name. When such a national institution shall finally come into being, it will be found to have unnumbered avenues of public service, for in it government by influence, so far as our national life is concerned, may be expected to reach its highest and most varied development.

But in a wider sense all academic and cultural institutions throughout the land have their share in the governmental influence of the nation. This is true whether they be public or private in their formal organization. The special responsibility of public schools and state universities cannot be overlooked. But all agencies of organized and permanent influence, scientific, artistic, or, in broader language, spiritual and moral, are parts of our one system of essential government. In this land more than in any other land, such agencies are carrying the new burdens of government and blazing the way for new modes of government. The more recent trend of our history lends double emphasis to this conviction.

We have taken a new place among the nations of the earth, and it is a matter of moment in world affairs that we preserve our essential character under the strain of these new relationships. The most obvious need that the new times have brought is the need of a larger army and navy.

That need is unmistakable and will be met, if it has not already been met. The most imperative need that the new times have brought is the need that we continue to give to influence rather than force the leading place in our political program. The new expenditures required to meet the need of more battleships and a larger standing army must be matched by new expenditures for the increase of knowledge and intelligence and moral power. If our expenditures for the higher influence shall lag behind our expenditures for force, we shall find the center of gravity of our policy shifting from its former placing among the finer elements of our national character to a new center in our military establishment. It is not necessary to exaggerate this danger. But danger there is, and it should not be blinked. We cannot escape it if, over a term of years, we permit our expenditures for war to grow more rapidly than our expenditures for education.

Our power in the world depends upon keeping our ideas, our standards, our convictions to the front. To spread abroad the love of truth as the scientist loves truth, the conception of justice as it prevails in our highest courts, the appreciation of honor and of beauty, and that freedom bounded by self-restraint which belongs alike to morals and to art — to spread these things abroad, and through them to win the admiration and confidence of the peoples of

other lands — that is the program for our world-politics if the higher influence is still to play its part in our affairs. Let all institutions of science and the arts join with our governmental schools and universities to magnify these things, along with our provision for the national defense. Their influence will double the strength of our army and our fleet, and will keep us still in the forefront of the world.

This new age, young men and women, as I have tried to assure you, is an age in which men are to be ruled more by their aims than by their fears. The forces of this world are to be subject to the purposes of the spirit. In a thousand ways which no one can foresee, men will try to make you believe that force rules and the spirit can only obey. Let no man take thy crown. The spirit rules, and force is only its minister. You are to be of those who will make this state a state in which righteousness is uppermost, the righteousness which religion cherishes, the righteousness which has its firm allies in science and the arts and in all liberal education. There is no private learning in a public school nor in any school. Science and public service are two sides of the same shield. You are servants of the state and the nation to-day, and we count on you and your fellows throughout the land to maintain our government as a government by ideas, a government by truth and righteousness.

II

THE SELF-RESPECT OF CITIES

An Address delivered at the Commencement Exercises of the University of Cincinnati, June 1, 1907. Published in the University of Cincinnati Record, June, 1907.

II

THE SELF-RESPECT OF CITIES

THERE is a noticeable difference in the way the men of different cities speak of the cities to which they belong. Each city, large or small, seems to be represented in a certain prevalent tone, of pride or disparagement, in which its citizens refer to their citizenship. And this tone comes in time to be so deep-seated and habitual that it can be altered only with the greatest difficulty.

It is good for any city and good for its people that it should be an object of their respect and pride. When Paul asked to be heard by the Chief Captain at Jerusalem, he said, "I am a man which am a Jew of Tarsus, . . . a citizen of no mean city." The words won for him his hearing, and they have reflected honor on the city of Tarsus through all the Christian centuries.

We Americans are ready to speak with familiar reproach of the things that lie nearest to us. On the whole, it is well that this disposition should take its course, for it guards us against a too easy complacency. There is something wanting in any

society that cannot stand a fair amount of criticism and even ridicule from those who know it best. Let criticism, even of the gargoyle-cartoon variety, have its way. Let it tap along our social engineering till the cracks and hollow places are revealed. But if our patriotism comes near enough home to touch the immediate community in which we dwell, we shall make the main note of our speech concerning the place of our abode a note of confidence and hope and pride.

For the most part, we find our people ready enough to plume themselves on the bigness of their cities, and on anything, indeed, that can be expressed in the superlative degree. That is our "Hyperbole of praise comparative." But I think we may observe among men of positive strength a certain reticence in the use of adjectives of comparison. Things can be compared only by being thrown into the same class. And for the more important things in the world such classification is pretty sure to obscure some of the characters which thoughtful men regard as things of price. No, comparatives and superlatives are not generally the most veracious forms of speech. That self-respect of cities of which I wish to speak to-night does not rest mainly on comparisons.

Let us turn our attention, then, to the things concerning the higher life of cities in which citizens may be expected to take an honorable pride.

We do not forget that cities have their side of shame which must on occasion be exposed; and we do not deny that the grosser triumphs of mere fatness and wealth in cities may have a glory of their own. But for to-night we will concern ourselves only with the things of higher worth and of good report. If there be any virtue and if there be any praise, let us think for a little time on these things. But in making some analysis of the things that confirm the self-respect of cities, you will not expect me to make immediate application to your own Cincinnati. The fame of your city is so broadly grounded and secure that all that I have to say might find notable illustration here. But it would not seem altogether felicitous that a stranger should undertake to assign praise before an audience who knows this community so much better than himself. Let the application be of your making. It can hardly be doubted that so it will be abundant and will be fairly distributed.

The higher life of the city is not an abstract notion, a thing apart from the city's material well-being. It is grounded in economic and commercial conditions. It is well that the citizen should take pride in the variety and extent of the city's commerce and manufactures, in the intelligence and integrity which mark its prevalent business methods, in the soundness of its banks, in the abundance of opportunity for labor, in the good

understanding between employer and employee, and in the general well-being of its laboring people. Without such conditions as these the higher interests of the city will be cramped and dwarfed; and it is, moreover, exactly in the maintenance of economic soundness that the moral strain of its men of affairs finds some of its finest testing and manifestation.

Closely connected with these things is the natural pride in the city's government. Such pride may well be excited when the people of all sections and classes interest themselves in the affairs of the municipality and participate in its political life; when the government has long been free from scandal, or when the occasional misconduct of public officials is promptly discovered and punished; when the burdens of taxation are fairly distributed and cause no more than a normal amount of grumble; when police and fire departments are conducted squarely and efficiently; when the health department shows results in a low and diminishing death rate, and epidemics are few and of brief duration; when water, light, and transportation may be had with no large percentage of exasperation over and above the ordinary cost of service.

Add to this a city's pride in its public parks, its children's play-grounds, its well-paved and shaded streets, in the architectural excellence of its public and private buildings, including sani-

tary regulation of the homes of the very poor—and we have a fair stock on which to grow those spiritual graces which are the finest flower of the city's life.

After all the rest is said, the crowning glory of any city is its men, who make every other excellence possible. Who are its eminent lawyers and judges? Are they men of more than ordinary learning and insight and power to carry a convincing argument? Have they persuasiveness of speech backed by a mastery of large affairs and of legal and moral principles? Are there among its physicians and surgeons men of unusual skill? Are its ministers of religion men of great devotion and great eloquence, wise in the spiritual concerns of their age and foremost in good works? Have its artists painted pictures and its authors written books that are a gain to the whole wide world? Are there in it men and women of large philanthropy who have skill to make their beneficence actually help toward self-help and self-respect, instead of breeding up new pauperism for others to relieve? Are its social leaders women of that fine and kindly grace that strengthens and purifies while it delights and entertains? And what of the public spirit of the city's men of affairs? Have they large thought for the public good, beyond their private concerns? We have had notable examples in our day of cities whose business men showed the power of pulling to-

gether in any great public concern, and the lack of that power and spirit has been to the discredit of other communities. It is bad for the self-respect of a city to look upon the ruins of any great public enterprise which has failed for lack of wide co-operation.

The public press of a city may be one chief source of the city's pride. We have seen examples in which a town of relatively small population has for long years influenced public opinion far and near through the daily issues of a newspaper edited with unusual ability. And in our more populous cities the influence of the newspaper press is a large element in municipal greatness. So, too, a city takes pride in the influence and general sagacity of its leaders in political life. Under our American system, every remotest district of the land shares in the government of the state and in the national government at Washington, in the persons of some of its chosen citizens. A city may well lift up its head, when from its people men are designated to bear the largest responsibility in state and national affairs and in representing this nation in its dealings with foreign powers. The glory of cities is their men of righteousness and strength, and it is good for a city to do them honor so long as their strength holds fast by righteousness. In some communities the position of "leader of the bar," accorded by common consent, is held

almost as definitely as the position of mayor of the city, and for a longer term. And there are communities, even cities of the larger class, that recognize in like manner their "foremost citizen," and claim him as a public good, however private his manner of life may be.

Finally, in this enumeration, we must mention among the grounds of a city's pride those long-standing organizations of men which may claim the dignified title of institution. There are its churches, each with a half-private history of its own, but each in its own way carrying the gleam of eternal aspiration through the fabric of the city's life. There are its hospitals, its benevolent and fraternal and industrial organizations, its libraries, its music and dramatic art. Shakespeare, a symphony orchestra, and a circulating library are pretty shrewd tests of the civilization of cities.

The most significant of institutional tests appears in the state of public education. Our people are generally ready to declare the praise of their public schools. It is well that this should be so, and the schools are generally worthy of their confidence. But unfortunately there are no readily applicable standards by which the public can discriminate between what is wholly worthy of praise in the schools and what is chiefly in need of improvement. One indication, certainly, of excellence in a system of public educa-

tion is its ability to hold the attendance of pupils beyond the earliest grades; and its provision of a succession of well-ordered and closely connected schools, one above the other, by which the way has been made clear and direct, for the poor as well as for the rich, up into the highest ranges of education which their natural abilities may fit them to reach. In this community we have the unusual example of a city system of schools carried forward till it culminates in a city university.

There are two influences which are working side by side throughout the land for the making of a higher civilization. They are the influence of cities and the influence of universities. The ideals of these two are not the same. Not infrequently they must antagonize each other. At other times each is supplemented or even reinforced by the other. The standard of the university represents the noblest things in our literary inheritance and our philosophy. It stands for the highest development, the continuous development, of pure science; and in our American educational system it has come almost equally to stand for the best attainments in the applied sciences. There is promise that in future it will join art to science, and so greatly enlarge its purpose and its influence. Already the beginning of this movement of the fine arts toward affiliation with the universities is seen, and we

may confidently expect that the movement will go on without interruption. In literature, in philosophy, in natural science, the university stands for pure devotion to truth, without a thought of gain or of any extraneous advantage. Its moral purpose is expressed in sheer, unselfish devotion to the public good as furthered by an unswerving search for truth.

The life of the city, on the other hand, involves the employment of the most concrete and powerful forces, material and economic. It makes of wealth and man's ambition a kind of universal instrument of its activities. But its foremost characteristic is its concentration of human intercourse. It sharpens the faculties of men by insistent opposition of ideas; but it also teaches men urbanity, an open-minded appreciation of the differing tastes and standards of many and diverse minds. It sets, moreover, a standard of its own in the meeting of men with men, a standard of social manner and common courtesy. Its moral purpose is seen in the effort to find the best ways of varied co-operation with one's fellow men, for the furtherance of the common good.

There is nothing more vital in our modern life than the interaction of these two ideals — the academic freedom of the university and the efficient cosmopolitanism of the city.

Wherever a great university is located in a

great center of population the two types of influence meet and mingle in ways that are full of significance. But where the two are bound together so intimately as in this community, where the university is part of the public system of education and the crowning member of that system, there is opportunity for peculiarly fruitful relations between them. The university is at once an added mark of civic distinction and an agency deliberately erected by the city to influence and possibly to recast the ideals and purposes of the city's life. What, under these circumstances, have they a right to expect each from the other? And in the first place, what may the university expect from the city which it adorns?

I can speak only as an inquirer into general educational movements and not as one having any intimate knowledge of the local situation here in Cincinnati. From this point of view, it would seem that the university may expect the city to understand its place and purpose, to hold it in the foremost rank among the objects of civic pride, and to give it the moral and financial support that it needs for the attainment of the highest academic ideals. The purpose to be a full modern university is a high ambition and more difficult of attainment than can be readily appreciated. For the modern university reaches out over many fields of knowledge. In the most

of those fields the best equipment, in books and apparatus, is costly and must be frequently renewed. A university, too, must have chiefly men: men of such eminence in their several fields that they are known in the great world of scholarship; men who are growing by research and becoming better known from year to year; men of such devotion to science and to the public good that they are an honor and an asset of great worth to any community to which they may belong. Such men are in demand in the university world. There are not enough of them to supply the need. The utmost care in the selection of such men and care to hold them when they have been attached to the university are among the first requisites in the management of such an institution. Every university rightly desires to have in its faculty at least one or two men, or more, who are the recognized leaders of the world in their several departments.

The relation of a city university to the city system of schools adds emphasis to considerations such as these. It is to be a drawing force which shall lure young people of promise up into those grades of study in which their talents may expand and reach their fit employment. It is to set high the standard of scholarship and of training for efficiency. The community should understand the greatness of this service and should turn the powerful forces that it has always

at command to the support of the institution which renders such service.

What, in turn, may the city expect from the university? It may expect that every pupil in every one of its primary schools and higher schools will be better taught, and will receive more of stimulus to higher things, for what the university has to give. It may expect that the hard commercialism of city life will be relieved by association with pure devotion to science and things of the spirit. It may expect that its reputation will be enhanced and men shall find it a better place to live because the university is there. It may expect that the other things which make for its honor and the higher life, its libraries, its museums, its music and all of the arts, its institutions of religion and philanthropy, will all receive manifold reinforcement and betterment, direct and indirect, from those influences which the university shall in time send forth.

And this is not all. For the city and the university must each react upon the other. The industrial needs of the community will give stimulus and direction to activities of the university. Pure science will be brought home to the processes of daily life. Your factories will do better work and make profit from the saving of what now goes to waste, because of better machines and methods and better men that the

schools will provide to meet the present need. The best commercial experience will be gathered up by the university and be organized into courses of training, and from those courses of training men and women will go forth to carry the better methods everywhere. Teachers trained in this university and in other universities will carry the higher culture and the spirit of scientific improvement into all of the elementary schools and so into all of the city's homes. Through such activities as these, the university will break through the isolation which has too often shrouded institutions of learning and will give itself frankly and freely to a real participation in the real life of the city. The outlook to such reciprocal relations between these two great, formative influences in modern civilization is encouraging and inspiring. The modern university is almost a city in itself. The modern city is responding to university influences. And when a great community assumes direction of a great institution of learning, it cannot fail to educate itself in the very endeavor to understand and to maintain the higher education.

One thing in particular I should like to say to the men of the University of Cincinnati, and one thing to the members of this graduating class. As a friend and brother, let me charge you, of the University, as I would charge the members of any university: Hold fast to the academic ideal of pure devotion to truth. You are

seeking to bring the university into the closest touch with the city's varied needs. And that is well. It is clearly the work for universities in this day, and untold good is to come from that work. But while doing this work, leave not the other undone. Your most effective service, your most practical service, depends ultimately upon your steadfast devotion to pure scholarship and scientific ideals. Do not lower any scientific standard for the sake of popularity. Do not let zeal for immediate commercial applications diminish your zeal in the pursuit of truth for its own sake. Your strength and influence and your ability to serve are all bound up with your essential loyalty to the abiding spirit of the true university. Such loyalty is a thing hard to achieve and desperately hard to maintain, but it is your very life.

I have no reason to believe that special exhortation is needed here; but is not the need a present need and the danger of defection a present danger everywhere, because of the very loftiness and severity of the ideal?

And you, young men and women of this class, let me charge you that from the university you carry into the life of the city a lasting devotion to the things that make for the city's good name. The true ideals of the university and the higher ideals of the city are in harmony with each other, and the city can greatly extend and enlarge the education given you by the university. But

there are lower ideals of city life with which the true university spirit must wage incessant warfare, and I hope you will wage that warfare by direct participation in the political and social affairs of the city. The great enemies are indifference and cynicism. When men try to persuade you that the improvement of the life of the city and the progressive wiping-out of evils is all an academic dream, be fully assured that you are tempted of the devil. The merit system in the public service, the attempt to improve the condition of the very poor, the striving after a better understanding between capital and labor, and all other urgent questions in the life of our municipalities — the true university spirit has something to offer toward the solution of these problems. But if the problems were easy there would be no need of the university spirit in dealing with them and no need of your giving them a thought. It is exactly because they are hard, and because men say that nothing can be done, and because university ideals are held to be quixotic and powerless in the face of such real difficulties, that you who have caught the university spirit should enter the struggle and stay with it to the end. If university graduates will fight it out along that line in all the cities of our land, it will appear that there is nothing better for the self-respect of cities than the things that universities have to give.

III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

An Address delivered at the Fiftieth Anniversary Exercises of the Michigan Agricultural College, at Lansing, Michigan, as Part of the Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual Convention of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations, May 30, 1907. Published in Bulletin 196 of the office of Experiment Stations, United States Department of Agriculture, December 10, 1907.



III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION

THE pioneer farmers of America had a double interest in life. First and foremost, they were pioneers, with all of the dangers and excitements of that pioneer life. Secondarily, they were farmers. It was hard and rude and unskillful, the farming in which they were engaged, but it gave them the necessities of life. When the first dull opposition of nature was overcome, when cabins had been built and woodlands cleared and the plow had in some way done its first work, the soil showed itself responsive and fertile enough. For a time, at least, life was easier. But the zest of pioneering was gone, and the more adventurous of our people soon moved on to the West, where they might feel the thin edge of civilization still cutting its earliest way through raw nature and barbarism, and know that that keen edge was their own life and endeavor. The farmers who remained behind were now farmers only and no longer pioneers. They saw the first rank fertil-

ity of the soil fall back into more moderate bounds. Their life became tame and binding. New wants arose with the rise of new social relations. A few in every community were able, by insight and energy, to keep still in the front of things in that new age, but for many the occupation which made up the greater part of their life had become an unpromising, uninspiring, unenlightened servitude. In this jubilee, to-day, we are to recall the ways in which new zest has been brought into the depressed life of the American farmer, the ways in which his farm has been made part of a new frontier and he has been made once more a pioneer.

At first the improvement of our husbandry was the work of a few men, and these were men whose interest in farming was, in large part, a public interest. George Washington was one of the earliest and one of the most influential of these. First in war and first in peace, he was also the first American farmer of his day. His outlook over the educational needs of the new nation included proposals for the establishment of boards of agriculture, a military academy, and a national university. Other statesmen with a care for agriculture and other farmers who were statesmen in their view, urged that practical provision be made for the collection and dissemination of agricultural information. In the opinion of these men it was information

that was chiefly needed to insure the general improvement of the farming industry — information regarding the experience and experiments of those who were already most advanced in the practice of husbandry. The new awakening in European agriculture had great influence among the leaders of American agriculture at this time.

It was while we were still under the Articles of Confederation that a beginning was made in the formation of agricultural societies. Pennsylvania and South Carolina had established such societies before the adoption of the Constitution. New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut followed during Washington's administration. The publications of these societies had begun to appear before the close of the eighteenth century, and agricultural fairs came into being in the first decades of the nineteenth century. Various endeavors to secure the establishment of a national board of agriculture had led, before the day that we here celebrate, to the first seed distributions through the national Patent Office, and to the first separate agricultural appropriation, in 1854.

Through these several movements, supplemented by a comparatively early development of an agricultural periodical literature, and through many later developments of agricultural organization, the growth of interest in the improvement of

rural conditions has long been actively fostered. But our attention to-day must be centered upon the development of organized agricultural education, and to that subject we will turn without any further delay.

Let us first note some bearings of agricultural education which have often been discussed, but must be considered here again in the interest of true educational perspective. Historically it has been found extremely difficult to bring the subject of agriculture into any manageable pedagogic form. The fact that everybody in the country knows something about it is at first a hindrance rather than a help. It is difficult to treat the subject in such manner as to avoid on the one hand an excess of platitude, a repetition of what every one knows, or thinks he knows, and on the other hand an excess of unutilized natural science, deeply interesting in itself but hard to apply on the farm. Certain other subjects, of which education itself is one, share in this handicap. It is a difficulty met with in European schools of agriculture, and it had not been overcome in Europe or America when the Michigan State Agricultural College came into being. The most effective training for manual occupations was still some form of apprenticeship, apart from schools, while the school had long held the foremost place in preparation for literary pursuits. How to combine, in one educative process,

the advantages of the school and the advantages of the apprentice system, was the problem of agricultural education. In one form or another it has been the problem of all our education for special occupations in the past half-century.

For the student of educational history, then, this problem of agricultural education appears as one phase, and a peculiarly difficult phase, of the larger problem of training for any particular vocation in life. You will not look to me to contribute anything to the special history of this institution, which others, here on the ground, may be expected to treat so much more effectively than I could treat it. But my theme deals rather with that broader movement of which the notable history of this institution forms a part.

It would be difficult to say just where and how systematic instruction in the principles of agriculture took its rise in this country. Such instruction was given in some sort in Moor's Indian School, out of which Dartmouth College arose, back even in colonial days. Benjamin Franklin proposed such instruction for the academy at Philadelphia, the forerunner of the University of Pennsylvania, but it does not appear that this part of his plan was realized. In the twenties and thirties of the nineteenth century great interest was excited in the so-called manual labor schools. It was proposed that a farm be attached to the schools, and that those who were studying

during a part of the day should engage in ordinary farm labor during another part of the day. The purpose, to be sure, was primarily to offer students an opportunity to "pay their way" through school. But there was a thought, too, of instruction in the better methods of farming, and at least a vague dream of something better yet, the vital union of thought and manual toil. Some of the old-line colleges showed at least good-will toward the scientific aspects of agriculture. Columbia even established a professorship under which agriculture was ranged alongside of other sciences. Then, just at the middle of the century, the state of Michigan provided in its constitution of 1850 for the establishment of an agricultural school, and seven years later this institution, the first of its kind and grade in the United States, was ready to enroll its first students. Pennsylvania had already incorporated its Farmers' High School, but it was preceded by two years in the actual opening by this State Agricultural College of Michigan. A little later in that same notable year, 1857, Justin S. Morrill of Vermont first introduced in Congress his measure for the endowment of agricultural and mechanical colleges in the several states by the national government.

What is especially worthy of note at this point is the fact that this movement, which was primarily a movement of the people or rather of the

leaders of the people, found parallel embodiment in both state and national legislation. At first both the states and the nation moved but slowly and tentatively. But within a few years large beginnings had been made. In this as in other public interests, within the broad limitations of the national Constitution, working adjustments of state and national agencies to each other have been made from time to time, in view of practical needs rather than of academic theories.

The great, epoch-making act of this whole movement was undoubtedly the Morrill act, which finally reached its passage when civil war had lent new power to the spirit of nationality in the national legislature. In signing this act, on the second day of July, 1862, Abraham Lincoln, that "new birth of our new soil," that surveyor of western lands, who was to bring to an end the labor of slaves on our American fields, took his decisive part in the effort to make our American tillage the work of men made free by knowledge and enlightened skill.

By the Morrill act of 1862, the national government gave aid to the states, in the way of liberal grants of lands; it encouraged the states to do in their own several ways the work of higher education in the domain of agriculture and the mechanic arts. While technical studies were brought to the front in this act, it refused to draw a line of opposition between those technical sub-

jects and the training which makes for liberal culture. And both technical and liberal training were joined with military instruction, as preparation for the defence of the nation's life.

Other important acts soon followed: That establishing a national department of agriculture, in 1862, which department was raised to cabinet rank in 1889; and that establishing a department of education, in 1867, which department was reduced to the rank of a bureau in 1869. In their different ways these two government offices have both had to do with the administration of the later acts for agricultural education, and I think I may add that on their effective co-operation depends the full realization in the future of the high purposes for which those acts were passed.

After the Civil War the establishment of agricultural colleges went steadily forward till such institutions, aided by the land grants of the general government, had been erected in all of the states, with eventually sixteen schools for colored students added in the southern states. The association of these colleges was organized, the Hatch acts brought new aid from the general government for the maintenance of experiment stations, the second Morrill act added its large federal appropriations for the furtherance of the ordinary work of the colleges, the summer graduate school was organized, the Adams act pro-

vided for advanced research in agriculture, and finally the Nelson amendment to the agricultural appropriation bill of 1907 has brought still larger financial support to the colleges, together with permissive provision for the use of a part of the federal grant in the training of teachers of agriculture. It is a record of notable advance, and we can hardly doubt that the great heart of Washington would have been glad to see the results that we may see to-day,

When we attempt to interpret the course of this educational development and to plan for further advance, we need the help of some general conceptions relating to our social organization. For it is evident that agricultural education cannot be a thing apart and alone. Its real and lasting strength is to be found in its connection with general education. And the strength of general education and of all of its special developments is to be found in the connection of the schools with the real life of our people.

Passing over all other views of our democracy, however essential and interesting they may be, permit me to call attention just now to the function of those who are called leaders in a democratic society; for we now commonly recognize the fact that democracy does not dispense with leaders, but rather makes the strongest demand for positive leadership. In such a society it is not for one individual or one class simply to lead

while another class simply follows. The true leader in a democracy is one who, while leading in all reality, is capable of learning from his followers. And the followers of such a leader in a true democracy are not those who follow because they do not think, but those who follow because they think and are able to recognize their leader. They follow because they are convinced. So our whole social fabric is made up of leaders who must learn if they would continue to lead, and their peculiarly restless and skittish constituencies. Here as everywhere the relation of leaders to constituencies is permanent and essential, but within that permanent relationship there is continual interplay and shifting of parts. It is a normal condition with us that those who have the subordinate part should be increasingly intelligent, critical, and ready to assume the actual leadership.

This is the state of things that our system of education fosters and must continue to foster. It must bring forth scientific experts who shall be able to teach the people the principles underlying the arts of life, and it must train up a people to make for the expert an intelligent constituency, quick to seize on all that he may offer for the betterment of their practice, and quick to reject those suggestions that they cannot put to use. So our public health rests upon the co-operation of highly trained experts in medicine

and sanitation and a people who can act intelligently upon their directions and regulations. So our public and domestic architecture is improving slowly—very slowly—through the co-operation of architects who know their art and a building people who know their architects, and who follow them in part and frustrate them in part. So, too, our agricultural education must proceed. There must be training of the highest sort for our agricultural experts. More than that, at the topmost reach of our agricultural education there must be that which is not commonly recognized as education at all, the pure research of the pure scientist. For no education can continue to be really alive unless it draw directly, from some source of new and abounding knowledge, a fresh supply, never yet handled and made common among mankind. It may be very little that any year or any age may have to give that is altogether new, but that little will sweeten all the rest.

Then, our system of education must reach down to schools of the lowest grade, the little country schools, in which the capable constituency of the great experts is to be trained; and there, too, some of the future leaders are to make their first beginnings. The most of those in such schools are to live by the practical art of farming. But in these days they are to have the skill to take the science of the scientist and transform it

into the art of their lives. They are to read agricultural bulletins and understand and use them. They are to pick their way and keep from being mired in the mass of such literature now provided for their reading. They are to attend institutes and conventions, where they will listen with discrimination to long and learned papers, and make short and pertinent speeches of their own. They are to find the farm interesting in the highest degree, because of new hopes of profitable production which it offers and because of its connection with the great world of ideas.

When we grow more skillful, we shall make elementary schools of a better-rounded type, in which the book-learning that has long been the distinctive province of the school shall join to itself the best things in the old system of apprenticeship, and from that combination shall arise something better than either one in its lonesome isolation. Already we are beginning to make institutions somewhat of this order, and it will be done much better yet as time goes on.

This, then, is what we may see as the ideal, in agricultural education and equally in education of other kinds, and perhaps of every kind: A system of schools complete in its sequence from the lowest to the highest, in which the study of books is closely joined with training for some of the practical arts of life; in which all practical training is kept in vital touch with general edu-

cation; in which the ability to form sound and stable judgments is sought throughout as a thing of great price; in which the higher schools send into the lower schools an unbroken succession of teachers who both know the truth and are able to bring others to a knowledge of the truth; and in which, finally, the stream of knowledge fresh and new, from some department of pure research, shall never fail to keep fresh and bright the old wisdom of the ages gone before. Or, in more concrete statement, our elementary schools and high schools in country communities are still to be primarily schools of general education, but with much more of training in the arts of the farm, and the sciences lying near to those arts; our state colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts are to prepare young men and young women to read intelligently the literature of scientific agriculture, to form independent judgments in agricultural matters, and to bring their new knowledge into connection with the real work of the farm; these state colleges, moreover, are to provide well-trained teachers of agriculture and related subjects for the elementary and secondary schools; the colleges of agriculture, still further, are to be co-operative educational institutions and not merely special and local institutions — they are to co-operate with similar institutions in other states, in order that the work of one may be strengthened by the work of all,

and co-operate with the universities of their several states for the innumerable advantages to both which may come from such united effort. The national Department of Agriculture is undoubtedly to continue its remarkably wide and influential work, its expert investigations, the issuance of its manifold and vastly useful publications, and its furtherance of all manner of agricultural education and research in the several states. Finally, the Bureau of Education is to do as thoroughly as possible the part of this work assigned to it. I venture the hope that with enlarged resources it may do more than it is now expected to do, and all without trespassing on the proper field of other institutions.

Let me speak a little more particularly of the part of this program which falls to the education office of the general government. It can do its best work, I think, as a co-ordinating influence. It can bring to the notice of the less favored institutions information concerning the experience of more advanced institutions. It can call attention from time to time to the relation of agricultural education to general education. It can survey the educational field and possibly point out dangers to be averted or weak places to be strengthened. It can, finally, discover things that need the doing and are not attended to by any other agency, and can see that some part of such lack is supplied. So much as this I hope the

Bureau of Education may be able to do for our agricultural education. And so much as this I may say it will undertake to do as far as its resources will permit.

In conclusion, the view cannot be too strongly stressed that all of this agricultural education is a contribution to the general education of the American people and to the betterment of American life. You who celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of this institution realize, as the history of this college has shown, that it is not simply larger crops and better breeds of stock and a more profitable output of farm manufacture for which you are laboring; but through these means and through all other interests of the modern farm you are working for the improvement of American citizenship, and that with special reference to the needs of this great state of Michigan. May you long continue to serve the Commonwealth and the larger Republic as faithfully and as successfully as you now serve them. And may every good cause in this land feel the reinforcement of a wholesome and vigorous life in the homes of our country communities, which have been made more prosperous homes and better homes because of the work that you are doing here.

IV

SOME RELATIONS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND SECULAR EDUCATION

Read at the Conference of the Religious Education Association at Los Angeles, California, July 10, 1907. Published in Religious Education, October, 1907.

IV

SOME RELATIONS OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION AND SECULAR EDUCATION

RELIGIOUS education cannot permanently employ methods which are out of harmony with the methods of secular education. Those methods may differ with the different subjects to which they are applied, but they cannot permanently contradict each other. The one will gradually assimilate the other. And the one that will assimilate the other, in any age, is the one that in that age has the wider hold on the convictions of men.

The relation of these two, each to each, varies and must vary from age to age. In the mediæval period it was institutional religion that exercised the wider sway, and secular education, if such it could be called, departed only occasionally or furtively from the ways of religious education. Now it is natural science that commands the more nearly unanimous assent of mankind. Science represents the united thought of our modern world, and modern education is allied with modern science. It is this type of education

that is dominant to-day, and we may confidently expect that in this age it will in large measure assimilate religious education to its standards and its processes.

The march of education, having this scientific and secular character, is one of the mightiest spectacles of our modern world. It is the central and unifying fact of modern civilization. The religion of this age is cleft by innumerable differences of faith and polity; that is, for the time being, it is normally and necessarily sectarian. There are seeming exceptions, but they will not disprove the rule. The science of this age is the same science all over the world. And modern education, overpassing partisan and sectarian bounds, overpassing even local, national, and racial bounds, is fast coming to be in its main features the same throughout the world, and to constitute one dominant, world-wide, human interest. *Der Glaube trennt die Völker, die Wissenschaft vereinigt sie.*

We cannot doubt that this age of sectarianism has a part of its own to play in the religious history of the nations. If it is a peculiarly unstable and transitional stage in the life of the church, it may be no less important to the rounding out of that life into its fulness than any other stage through which the church has passed. But so long as religion is predominantly sectarian, it may not expect to regain its ascendancy over

the institutions and the methods of education. Universal education gravitates toward universal knowledge and toward universally recognized forms of thought. The partial and unprevailing view of any party or sect is not at home in public schools, even though it be a view which shall eventually lead the world. Religion in its modern relations, sectarian religion, is a breeder of disturbance in those national systems of education in which it now holds a place in accordance with a tradition all unconsciously outgrown. Disturbance is often wholesome, but not disturbance of this kind; for it is full of bitterness, and often it appeals to simple prejudice. Such disturbance doubtless will continue, working some little good and any amount of harm, till the tradition which sustained the official teaching of religion among those peoples shall be cast aside. Where the tradition has already passed away or where it has never become established, the teaching of any system of religious doctrine is to be steadily excluded from public and common schools. Formal instruction in religion will be out of place in public schools wherever and so long as religion is sectarian, wherever and so long as the method of religious teaching is greatly at variance with the methods of secular education.

And will the time ever come when these limitations will no longer prevail? I am not a

prophet, but I have no doubt that such a time will come — not in our day, but in the course of generations or of centuries. The topmost crest of the sectarian wave in our religious history would seem already to be past. It is a wave centuries long and it may be ages long, but it is a receding wave. Men still emphasize their religious differences; but already there is notable gain in the emphasis of religious agreement. It is a change that points toward a day when sectarian distinctions shall be decisively subordinated to religious affirmations as wide as undegenerate mankind. The differences will not disappear, and agreement will not be attained by the mere cancellation of differences. But the differences will, I think, become subordinate and tributary. And, by ways that none but a prophet can foresee, by revivals of religious thought and power such as the world has not yet known, the spirit of man will come to new convictions of religious verity, and they will be wider and deeper than the unities of the past.

We cannot doubt it, for we believe that religion as well as science stands for a permanent need of the human soul, and stands in truth for the supreme need of the human soul. As long as our temporal incompleteness brings its manifold strain upon the life within us, so long we shall find ourselves stricken with need of some eternal perfectness. And the religion which answers

to this need will be either the conscious and dominant interest of our lives or the large background of our lives; unless it be indeed in occasional conditions of disease, sporadic or epidemic, where for a time the sense for religion may seem to be altogether lost — yet only for a time.

But in education and religion, as in all things else, no age is final and complete. Every age must do its part in preparation for the next, it must contribute its part to the whole of human history. Yet, if the conditions of this age are not permanent, they are permanent and imperative for this age. Let us now look a little further into present-day relations of education and religion, viewing them as a stage in the long-continued development of such relations — a process that has run through ages that have been and must run through the ages to come — yet as having a certain immediate finality for the times in which we live.

So far as modern education is concerned, we see that it is allied not only with modern science but with democracy. Even in monarchical lands this is true, in subtle ways that are very wide in their reach. In our own land the alliance between education and democracy is open and absolute. Our secular education, as both democratic and scientific, finds its greatest elevation, it makes its warmest claim to the devotion of

men, on the moral plane. Democratic education seeks the good of every man because he is man, and so reaches its high moral conception of social service. Scientific education teaches men to follow truth for the sake of truth, in the full conviction that human interests and clear truth must in the end be one. In its pure devotion to truth, natural science is moral, unswervingly moral. The best that education draws from the scientific alliance is not even the perfected method which science has to teach, but its moral elevation, its power to awaken a new devotion to truth. In loyalty to truth and in disinterested social service our public education rises to the summit of its power.

What, then, is the character of religion, in this age of sectarianism, which may call for special consideration at this point?

Religion is not only a permanent human fact, but certain of its aspects and elements can be distinguished as likewise abiding through historic change. Consider the aspects of doctrine, of ritual, of institutional organization, and of ethical spirit, not to mention others at this time. The student of ecclesiastical history knows how indissolubly these are bound together; but he knows also that in the history of the Christian church now one and now another has held the dominant place. Such shifting from age to age of the center of gravity of religion is of the deep-

est significance in the history of the higher life of mankind.

In the religious thought of these present times we see a turning away from the doctrinal and the ecclesiastical elements that laid a strong hold on the minds of men in other days. Within the church the interest in these things is languid as compared with that of an earlier age. And we cannot forget that a great part of the religious aspiration and emotion of our day arises outside of the church. It will not be contained in the old dogmatic and institutional forms. It has not made new forms for itself, and, in truth, it does not much care to make new forms. Yet that is not to deny to it altogether the religious character. It is an overflow religion. For the most part it may be recognized as an overflow Christianity.

Now, if there are no institutional forms and no systematic theology that have succeeded in gathering up and unifying this overflow of religion, it does, in fact, find some internal unification, which makes of it one tendency and not many unrelated tendencies. And that unifying principle is humanitarian and ethical.

Even in the church, and particularly in the Protestant churches, it would seem that the turning away from those earlier centers of religious conviction, the system of doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, were to work out as a definite

turning to a center of moral conviction. But not moral as touching mere practice according to customary standards. It is rather the moral as essential righteousness with which we are here concerned. And again, not righteousness as a term in a system of theology, but righteousness as apprehended by the large human sense which values the right above the wrong, and that overwhelmingly.

Already the signs of such new centering of religion clearly appear. For many in this present age, religion is reached by way of the moral sense, rather than morals by the way of religion. It is not that the historic authority, the miracles, the incense of religion, bring men to religious convictions, which thereafter are the ground of all of their moral convictions; but it is rather that through the moral sense, through hunger after righteousness, they find a moral universe in which the all-righteous God is their Father.

It is not to be supposed that this new centering of the religious life is the ultimate term of our religious development, any more than those earlier centerings have been. It has its dangers and inadequacies, as they had. Other centers, perhaps those that the past has known, but in new form and heightened power, must send forth a corrective influence in their turn when this age has done its work. But this age, I think, must work out its religious advance, a great and

true advance from the point at which it began, by realizing the full meaning of those moral conceptions which have taken strong hold upon it.

We have come now to a point where it will appear that, for the sake of religion itself — in order that religion may do its proper work — education must be true to its proper character for the age that it serves. The most vital meeting place for education and religion in this age is on the moral plane. Through its new emphasis on moral conceptions, education itself, secular education if you would call it such, may help religion to work its way through and overcome its present-day sectarianism. Education will be the best ally of religion in this age if it hold true to its alliance with science and democracy.

Observe how vitally the several lines converge. Democracy stands for the brotherhood of man. Religion bases that brotherhood on what is ultimately a more cohesive and organic conception, the Fatherhood of God. But where an earlier age found the brotherhood of man through the fatherhood of God, this age seems destined to find the fatherhood of God through the brotherhood of man. Pure devotion to truth is found in both religion and science. Historically, the religious sense for truth appears as a very different thing from the scientific sense for truth. They seem, indeed, to antagonize and cancel each other. Yet farther down they are at one.

And from that farther depth, below the roots of the everlasting hills, their unity must arise into the day of human history.

If this be a true reading of the signs, the same moral conceptions are coming to be the uppermost convictions in science, in democracy, and in religion. It may not be too much to expect that this unity shall some day come to full realization, and may we not then find that diverse religions have come to unity among themselves in this very process of coming into accord with democracy and science on the high ground of moral conviction? I am very sure that this will not be all; but I think this may be a part of the way by which religion and education shall do their work together for this age, and for the ages that are to follow.

For the present, then, we may be content to see a large part of mankind making their way, even unconsciously, toward a genuine religious faith through their moral aspirations and endeavors; while we still hold to that ultimate creed that our moral life will never come to its best until its deepest convictions are joined with hopes and affections and beliefs touching some larger and more enduring life, the true and eternal life of the Spirit.

Finally, the relationships of modern education are to be widened. A too absorbing alliance with natural science is to be avoided, even if

modified by the alliance with democracy. A closer alliance with modern art is to be cultivated. At an earlier period, education suffered from a too absorbing association with art, particularly with literary art. Now new relations with the arts are desirable, to correct the dangers of the scientific alliance, in its more extreme manifestations.

And art, too, has moral implications which are ineradicable. Its narrowest devotees cannot isolate it altogether from the rest of life. While warring against a too narrow devotion to natural science, it meets both science and religion on the moral plane, and in some degree it mediates their differences. It recognizes values as well as facts; it prizes instinct and the mass play of human emotion as well as analysis and geometric law; and — chiefly this — it has canons which represent the matured experience, the chastened pang and rapture, of the race, and are not to be disclosed or verified in any moment of time by any individual fragment of the race.

When modern education has fully entered into this threefold alliance with natural science, democracy, and art, its newer, safer, and more fruitful alliance with religion will, we doubt not, be near at hand and even at the door.

V

THE CULTURE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

*An Address delivered at Vanderbilt University, June 15,
1909. Published in the Methodist Review, September,
1909.*

THE CULTURE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS

THE subject upon which I am to speak is either one of the dullest or one of the most interesting in all the world. That depends upon the point of view of the listener and upon the speaker's own interest in what he has to say. As everybody knows, the talk about morals which may be designated as moralizing is prosaic and platitudinous to the last degree. This is a fact of common knowledge, and it sometimes obscures our appreciation of another fact, namely, that there is no set of questions about which men to-day speak with greater warmth than questions of right and wrong. In the social circle, at the club, in our public journals, to say nothing of courts of justice and schools and churches, the thoughts and emotions of men are most deeply stirred when discussion reaches some vital question of wrong and righteousness.

There is substance in questions such as these. They are daily food for men and women of

force and character and influence. An ancient writer told of the blessedness of the man whose delight is in the law of the Lord, and added that "in His law doth he meditate day and night." A fine picture is this of the man who draws his strength from familiar converse with high and moral themes. "My son," another wise man said, "if thou . . . incline thine ear unto wisdom . . . then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, . . . then shalt thou understand righteousness and judgment and equity."

So, even at the risk of missing my aim and being platitudinous and moralizing after all, I purpose speaking directly to the subject of morals to-night — to this most inviting subject of private and public righteousness. The theme is peculiarly inviting when one is face to face with a class of university students, for the finest personal gains from a university course are found in the heightening of one's ability to deal with the highest questions of all, which in large measure must always be questions of the ethical realm; and a university graduate, always a public beneficiary and therefore a debtor to his community and state and nation, is expected to render public service in the furtherance of public morality.

The very bigness of the theme, however, renders it obviously impossible to discuss it in this hour in any systematic or comprehensive

way. I am sure you would be appalled and wearied from the beginning if the speaker were to attempt such a task. He is the more free, accordingly, to exercise a certain caprice. He may select a few topics here and there without much order or rationality, merely because he would like to say something about them, and when he is through with these, he may come to an end. With all deference, then, to those heroic listeners who would prefer a discussion some hours in length with logical heads and sub-heads and a rhetorical beginning and end, I beg you to let me follow this simpler and less exacting way.

In the first place, then, let us think of the moral life as a process of growing better. In this view we may indeed be not far from the essential character of all true morality. A tree that does not grow does not live, and a stationary goodness is hardly a possibility. We may go a step further and say that no man can be good except by being better than he is by nature. But this putting of the case amounts to pretty much the same thing as the other; for any sort of excellence once achieved soon becomes habit and second nature, and the only way one can then continue to be good is to go on outgrowing the virtue which he has already accomplished. Among the most hopeless characters in human society is a good man who does not change,

whose virtues are wrought out to a finish like the features of a marble statue, a man who nevermore will strive and sweat and resist temptation even unto blood. We may say the same of communities. A highly moral and irreproachable society may, after all, be immoral in its stationary complacency. There is better hope for genuine righteousness in a changing order which is striving after improvement. It may run great risk of moral loss for the sake of the greater moral gain. There is hope for such a community in that its virtues are not to be kept under glass but rather to be worked out and lived through and then discarded for something better.

Then, there are two sides of morality which we should consider, the side of wisdom and the side of companionship. One-half of genuine morality is ideas. This fact is not to be forgotten, particularly when we are under the stress of intense convictions or of emotional appeals from without. One good half of all morality is wisdom, and therefore it is the duty of every man to be wise. I have just been reading over again the Imperial Rescript on education which is the basis of moral instruction in the schools of Japan, and I am struck by the fact that among the standards of virtue which it sets up, along with the exhortation to "be filial to your parents, affectionate to your brothers and sisters," and "bear

yourselves in modesty and moderation," is this further exhortation to "pursue learning and cultivate arts, and thereby develop intellectual faculties and perfect moral powers." In many ways our American standards are different and must be different from those of the Japanese, but we need no less than they to inculcate as a moral duty the obligation to follow after knowledge. Our righteousness will be a low and unstable value, it will fail us in our time of need, unless it be grounded in our most coherent thought as well as in our impulses and our sentiments.

There are two ways in which the strain comes at its worst in our moral life. One is the sudden and unexpected test, the perplexity or temptation which arises without warning and must be met on the instant. The other is the long-continued stress of untoward circumstance which wearies out the patience and brings an emotional tension to its highest pitch. In both of these cases the steadying power of thought is most sorely needed. In both of them our thinking in the time of need must be largely determined by the thinking we may have done before the need arose. We cannot school ourselves to right thinking in the very hour of emergency. The schooling must have gone before. The emergency is the test, the final examination that tries its quality. From this point of view the deliberate training

of our schools and colleges comes to a higher dignity. It is, all the time, preparing for some far-off emergency. It is preparing for the exercise of judgment in some crisis, when passion shall claim absolute control.

I have had other occasion to make note of the close connection between the judicial spirit and the scientific spirit. To cultivate the scientific spirit in the schools is to prepare for the exercise of the judicial spirit in the affairs of life. In both we have an example of the value of impersonality.

There is an aspect of human life in which we must shake ourselves free from personal considerations and look upon things objectively and impartially. We shall never get the highest good out of personality until we have given fair play to this impersonality. The judge on the bench and the scientist in the laboratory are not to be swerved by immediate personal preferences. They are seeking the truth which shall stand the test of all time and circumstance, and which shall therefore serve the personal needs of the world and not the personal whims of the passing hour. So our education, which shakes us free for the time from a thousand little desires, partialities, and preferences, from prejudice and partisanship, is building up within us that judicial spirit for which we shall find sore need when we meet the instant issues of life.

But if such wisdom makes one half of our

moral life, it is personality that makes the other half, the warmer and more exhilarating half. It is a part of man's duty to be wise, it is also a part of his duty to be companionable. One of the brightest of our bright men has said, "Be good and you will be lonesome." It would not be so bright but rather more true to say, "If you don't get over being lonesome, you can't be more than half good." Our ideal of public and private virtue is not the ideal of the isolated moralist, who would simply instruct his fellows and make of the community his personally directed kindergarten. It is rather the ideal of the man who joins warm hands with his fellow men to go forward with them in a common cause.

It is not easy at this point to say exactly the right thing and neither more nor less. How shall a man keep step with his fellows and yet lead them to better things? How shall he lead them unless he be a part of their life, a partisan with them, a sectarian with them, a partner of their loves and hates, whose aspirations are their own? It seems an insoluble problem, and yet it is the problem that the moral leaders of our race have solved. Macaulay said of Peter the Great that he civilized his people and was himself a barbarian. A moral leader of to-day will lead his people without leaving his place in their ranks.

There are some who will tell you that you cannot lead others in the way of improvement if you

are too much better than they, that you must have some of their vices if you would lead them into virtue. And this doctrine easily runs to the extreme in which the would-be leader cannot be distinguished by any loftiness of his ideals from those whom he would lead; and one short step beyond this, the leader falls below the level of his followers and becomes indeed a hindrance to their progress. It is hard enough to decide in any particular case, and it is the particular cases that count. I do not think that any man ever finds it necessary to be less moral in order that he may help his fellow men to be more moral; but the truth that there is in this compromising view is the truth that his companionship makes up a large part of a man's moral life. Under ordinary social conditions an austere separatist not only forfeits the greater part of his influence through his separatism: he forfeits thereby a great part of his own moral life, not only in the lower moralities but in the higher moralities as well. The company that a man keeps is and must always be a great part of himself.

What I have said thus far comes to this, that the moral life is found at its best only where there is found a well-balanced growth in righteousness. Now, there is another way of looking at the rounding out and balancing of the moral character, concerning which something may be said. Taking account once more of both the individual and the

community, what shall we say of the cultivation of special virtues, what of the prosecution of special reforms?

A man makes it his particular business to rise early in the morning, to be benevolent, to wage war on gambling or profanity. A woman undertakes to tell the literal truth in all her social intercourse. A community organizes a campaign against drunkenness or municipal corruption.

It is obvious enough that the special undertaking distorts the perspective of our moral world. The campaigner in the one Cause not only makes himself a thorn and a weariness to those who are not enlisted in the same campaign: he inevitably exaggerates that aspect of righteousness to which his attention is devoted, and so far forth he renders it more difficult for the world to understand the main significance and worth of righteousness. He glorifies reform and thereby discounts something better than reform, the practice of building right, from the ground up, on the lines of a well-wrought plan. In nine cases out of ten he lays his emphasis upon some negation, and so gives greater currency to that word of universal paralysis — *Don't*. What shall we say to things like these?

The first thing to be said, in order that there may be no mistake, is that, in the world we live in, the special reform is inevitable and indispensable. With all of its drawbacks it is still a main

reliance of humanity for any moral awakening. Human nature is not big enough to do all things at once. It must ever and again become absorbed in the partial task, or else spread itself out over a world of possibilities in thin, reflective, even-balanced inefficiency. Better than this, a thousand times better, are those nodes of concentrated activity where practical men see the urgent need of their time and fight their fight with the Enemy as they find him.

But when so much has been said, we may return to the undoubted evils that attend any reform campaign, whether it be a campaign in the spirit of a man or in society at large, and may see if anything can be done about them. Those evils, in a word, are the evils that go with favorite virtues. No man can devote his best energies to a selected and preferred virtue without danger to his moral life. The favorite virtue brings with it a favorite vice or a whole company of favorite vices. One of these is likely to be the vice of self-righteousness. Another is that of intolerance. Still another is that peculiar form of vice in which the exaggerated virtue is made a substitute for other, starved and neglected, virtues; the one great good covering a multitude of sins, in a way which scripture precedent would not warrant.

The members of a band of thieves pride themselves upon their loyalty to the gang. The highwayman who robs the rich gives generously to the

poor. A body of young men who uphold the highest standard of truth and honesty show an easy conscience as regards drink and gambling and the social evil. Even women of the purest virtue, as the word virtue is commonly used, are sometimes sadly lacking in the sense of fair play, as men of honor understand fair play, and fail to realize that uncharitable words are another form of vice.

Favorite vices go with favorite virtues. This fact should not deter us from cultivating chosen virtues when occasion may demand, But it should put us doubly on our guard. Let us have, if need be, the campaign against a conspicuous wrong. But let it be recognized as an emergency measure. Our main business is right living, all round and all through. The great reform has its necessary work to do. But, as soon as possible, that work is to be finished. It is to be laid aside, in order that the regenerated individual or community may enter upon the normal course of general growth. That normal course is the course in which wisdom joins with tolerant fellowship, holding men up to an ideal of everlasting improvement.

It is here that we are chiefly concerned with the culture of righteousness — in maintaining and confirming the general conception of life which looks to incessant moral betterment. Here is a subject for the daily meditation of wise men and women, for the training of children in the schools,

for consideration in every profession, institution, and society which has influence in the shaping of our corporate or individual life. Let us think often upon these things and let us seek after the better ways.

But many of you, I am sure, have felt a lack in this discussion hitherto. It has had reference to virtues and vices as if these, in aggregation, made up our moral being. You have felt that righteousness cannot be achieved by adding one pagan excellence to another; that we must have regard instead to motives, to faith and hope, to some vitalizing spirit which shall bring to every man a moral strength beyond the strength of any man. You look, in other words, for some recognition of the religious side of morals, with the conviction that the thing omitted is the really essential thing. This view appeals to me so strongly, and accords, in fact, so nearly with my own thought, that I should be altogether unwilling to let the occasion pass without some mention of this aspect of my subject, though the difficulties of this part of the discussion are obvious and plentiful.

Any attempt at the cultivation of righteousness merely by the cultivation of enumerated virtues can give us only an incoherent and machine-made morality. The moral life, to reach its highest efficiency, must hold with the largest wisdom and the highest fellowship to which the moral agent can attain — that is, with his religion, or what

serves him as a religion. Only so can it come to its proper coherence and vitality.

How much of vitality and coherence religion may supply will appear from a mere passing glance at some of the conceptions of Christianity. We speak of righteousness. In the words, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in Heaven is perfect," all human excellence is thrown into such comparison that it looks black, as a candle flame against the brightness of the sun. But while all human worth suffers this deep disparagement, the value of the human soul is raised to such a height that it can be calculated only in terms of the death of the Son of God. Hope reaches no less a pitch of confidence than that this mortal life shall share in the life of God Himself, and all perspectives of this earthly existence are readjusted to the view from the gates of Heaven. Love, purified, quickened, elevated, by the vision of love divine, made universal in the recognition of human brotherhood, becomes the ruling motive of life. The uplift of such conceptions, when they are fairly apprehended and appropriated, is well-nigh inconceivable. Their dynamic possibilities are past all computation. In a world in which such ideas are at work, as positive convictions in the hearts of men, we cannot doubt that the greatest moral elevation will be attained in lives which acknowledge their supremacy.

Yet the very loftiness of these conceptions forbids that any one human mind should actually take in their full significance. To assimilate them in their entirety is the work of the human race in the ages upon ages. One age, one society, one individual, may interpret them in part. Even that is a great achievement. But the partiality of the interpretations cannot be overlooked when we are dealing with the moral interests of present-day society. The man, the church, the people, who approach the moral life by the starry way, which is also the cloudy way, of the religious life, cannot escape the same need that all others are under, the need of cultivation of the moral sentiments, the need of daily betterment as regards moral insight and the practice of righteousness.

A man's religion may indeed become for him a preferred virtue with its attendant vices. I was told, once on a time, of an influential man of business who gave largely to the support of the church and became deeply interested in its activities. A friend suggested that he should join its membership in his home community. He asked to see the list of its communicants. This list he ran through quickly, then threw it down in disgust.

"Do you think I will go in with such an [expurgated] set —" he did not say *expurgated*; the word merely represents what I have done with his speech — "Do you think I will go in

with such a —— set of dead-beats? They don't pay their debts." Now, assuming that this remark, apart from its profanity, was justified in the situation to which it was applied, what was its significance? I think it showed that the man of affairs made a favorite virtue of paying one's debts, and let it excuse his measure of irreligion; while the church members to whom he referred made their religion a favorite virtue, and let it excuse their measure of laxness as regards their business obligations.

Perhaps a more common case may be found in the devoted adherent of some form of religion whose special indulgence is in the vice of self-complacency, of self-righteousness. It was this that called forth the sharp rebukes of Jesus in his meetings with the Scribes and Pharisees. It would be hard to estimate the injury which this failing has done to both morals and religion in all the ages. Clear thought, again and again, has lost its rightful influence among men because joined with this uncompanionable vice, this enemy of all goodly fellowship, intolerance toward those who follow other ways.

And there are other ways, which may be Christian, profoundly so, while not bearing conspicuously the name of Christ. The two poles of Christianity may be found in the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. Each of these implies and involves the other. A theological age

laid conscious emphasis on the doctrine of the Fatherhood. A humanitarian age now lays its emphasis on Brotherhood, and is often hesitant and reticent as regards the language of *Our Father*. It may be that this reserve is not irreligion at all, but only the way in which this age can most surely approach the real experience of religion.

Yet the responsibility for an orderly interpretation of Christianity, consecutive with the interpretations of the past, rests in this age with the church, as in all other ages. The church is still the teacher of religion. The necessary separation of religious instruction from our secular schools leaves this great burden, with all of its weight and all of its honor, with the church alone. For my part, I believe the church will not fail to carry that burden safely and well, and even to larger issues than can at this time be foreseen.

But in this very separation of functions, another moral responsibility, great and high, is laid upon our secular education. I have spoken of the value of impersonality, as it appears in one necessary stage of the making of human character — the impersonality of courts and of sciences, which are no respecters of persons. These things ultimately are not impersonal, for they help us to a purer and truer understanding of human relations. But they do this by first casting out human prejudice, passion, and preference, casting out

all hopes and fears, and leading men into the impartial recognition of objective reality. Now, I think I shall not be misunderstood if I say that the teaching of morals apart from religious sanctions has a place in our scheme of life analogous to that of these impersonal disciplines. It is not impersonal as regards human relations, but only as regards that unseen world with which religion is concerned. And here, I think, it is not ultimately irreligious, but only, for the time, non-religious. As such, it has a part to perform, a part of great dignity and importance, in setting forth those purely ethical conceptions, unmixed with any thought of supra-natural rewards and punishments, which even the ancient pagan world found to be strong meat for its noblest intellects, and which appear to not a few writers of this modern age to be the highest themes with which the mind of man can deal.

It is not that I would offer such teaching as sufficient for all human need. Men need good news and a Father in Heaven as much in this age as in any former age. But the study of ethical knowledge and the training in simple morality of life is not only of value to the individual doer and student: it is of value even to religion itself. It brings the teachings of religion ultimately before the impartial judgment of that simple sense of difference between right and wrong which the Creator has put

into the spirit of man, and has trained and developed through the long course of his history. The strongest appeal which religion can ever make is the appeal to this human sense of moral difference; and the cultivation of that sense, through science and literature and historical studies, through conduct in the little world of the school, is the noblest service which our general education has to render. It is a service to religion and law and common intercourse and to every other interest of our modern life.

This is your Commencement, members of this graduating class. You commence to be bachelors of arts and various other things. You are coming out from this University into more direct participation in the world of affairs — affairs which reach their highest difficulty and highest significance in questions of right and wrong. The boys in a swimming pool, particularly on a chilly day, are wont to call to their fellows on the shore, "Come on in, the water is fine!" And so we who left school life for active life a good many years ago now call to you, young men, "Come in, this Twentieth Century is fine!" Science and invention are making readjustments a daily necessity. Prosperity is making it harder every day to hold up to the old moral standards. There is great danger that with a better living we shall get a poorer life. People are crowding now, where a generation ago they were few. Yet we feel the

need of sharing more fairly all good things of life with all of our fellow men. Faiths are changing. Even while we hold them most tightly we find that they are gone, leaving only their clothes or their shadow behind, and we do not see clearly what is to take their place. Come in! It is a world of genuine difficulties in which it is worth while to live and take one's part as it comes.

Faith, Hope, and Love — they are with us yet; justice, truth, and the law of righteousness — they loom as large as ever. Though their forms are less sharply defined, yet none the less surely they dominate the scene. Liberty and law are wrestling with each other still. They clinch like deadly enemies, and the sweat of their conflict now and again is red with human blood. Yet they are lovers, more true to each other than were even David and Jonathan, and their struggle is all for the good of mankind. Come, young men, and take your part. Be as wise as you can with the heads that have been given to you. Be as companionable as you can without becoming less wise. And do not doubt that the God of your fathers will help you as He helped your fathers before you and that all that Heaven gave into their lives, Heaven will give into your lives as well.

And you, young women, who are about to leave this institution, you will find many alumnae of American colleges awaiting you. And these

American alumnæ have already acquitted themselves so well that larger work, larger responsibilities, larger joy of service, are sure to be yours. Come, young graduates, men and women both, and enter upon a new course of study, the life-long study of righteousness, which, as it is a study laid out for us by God Himself, when He laid the courses of all human affairs, shall through its various leadings lead us back to God.

VI

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE MOVEMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

An Address before the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Lake Mohonk Conference on International Arbitration, May 23, 1907. Published in the Report of the Meeting.

VI

THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN THE MOVEMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION

BY way of introduction, I may venture to repeat the recommendation touching this subject contained in my first annual report as Commissioner of Education. It reads as follows:

The second recommendation which I would respectfully present is concerned with the fact, which every year makes more obvious, that our public education has passed into an international stage in its development. The approach of the second International Peace Conference at The Hague has turned public attention to the many-sided modern movement toward a peaceful adjustment of international relations. Governments, in striving to maintain an honorable peace, require the reinforcement of popular sentiment, and it is of the utmost importance that such public sentiment should steadily demand a peace which makes for righteousness, and no other peace than that which will make for righteousness. A public sentiment calling for such peace will be stable only when it rests upon an appreciative understanding of other nations. In this there is a great work for education the world over, that it help the nations understand one another. Whatever the schools may do to this great end will count for real education.

Can any form of learning, in fact, be more liberalizing, more expanding, more tonic, than the insight gained through knowledge of other peoples, our contemporaries, who with us are the makers of modern history?

Already a considerable movement is under way looking to the annual commemoration in the schools of the United States of the opening of the first Hague conference, which occurred on the 18th day of May, 1899. Such a celebration seems eminently desirable, by way of laying due emphasis in the schools upon the vital relations of modern peoples one to another. I would accordingly recommend that, so far as consistent with state and local conditions, the 18th day of May in each year be designated as a day of special observance in the schools. It is particularly desirable that in the celebration of this anniversary day, and in the instruction of the schools throughout the year, the effort be made to promote an insight into the true aims and aspirations of our own nation and of the other nations with whom we are to work together in the making of a higher world civilization. This view calls for a more thorough teaching of geography and history in the elementary schools, that the first notions formed by the children in those schools, of our relations with other lands and peoples, may be true and temperate; it calls for a better teaching of modern languages and literatures in our secondary schools and colleges; and in the more highly specialized studies of commercial and technical schools, it calls for more thorough and accurate instruction in all subjects having to do with the relations of our home land with foreign lands.

This is not a foreign view of American education, but rather an American view; for it is already clear that American institutions can reach their full development only by finding their rightful place in the current of the world's history, and that only by so doing can they become fully American.

While no one will attach supreme importance to the special observance of one day in the school year, even such annual emphasis upon this theme will not be without its value. I am the more disposed to think that it may be of some significance, from the fact that the idea of such observance has arisen quite independently in the minds of different persons engaged in widely separate educational service. I had planned to make this recommendation and had actually written the first draft of it before I knew that such a plan had occurred to any one else. When it transpired that a well-defined movement to this end was already under way, I was glad of the opportunity of adding what I might to the impetus of that movement.

It is clear, however, that a celebration which breaks from a clear sky on one day in the year and passes from thought when that day is past, cannot take a deep hold on the minds of many children. Nor do I think we have a right to devote one day of the school year to a purpose which has no connection with the ends of general education. It is not with a view to propaganda of an isolated reform that this day is entitled to its special place in our school calendar, but with a view to a neglected and essential element in general education. And that element is an appreciative understanding of other peoples than our own.

The child brought up apart from other children misses his best chance of a practical education. So a people that goes on in ignorance of other peoples or in blind antagonism to other peoples, misses its chance of adding their civilization to its own. It is just this element of a liberal education which should be emphasized in the schools, not one day in the year but throughout the year — such a knowledge and appreciation of the other peoples of the earth as shall help us to add the good things of their civilization to our own civilization and to live with them in the enjoyment of civilized relationships. Even well down in the elementary schools, the effort of our little Americans to overcome the primitive distrust and disparagement of the peoples of foreign lands is a liberalizing influence. It is, indeed, an Americanizing influence.

But this, after all, is but a small part of what the schools ought to do to promote international arbitration. The best that they can do, in the long run, is to foster the genuine spirit of arbitration, and to establish those modes of thought that dispose men to arbitrate their differences. Let us consider here three ways of settling differences among men, and see what the teaching of the schools may be expected to do by way of furthering that type of thought which lies nearest to arbitration. The primitive way of settling a quarrel is an appeal to arms, a decisive physical

fight. This is the spontaneous method of uncontrolled anger. But it has in it many nobler elements, and chief among these is the religious faith that the God of might and right will add His strength to the strength of the righteous cause. Each combatant is sure that the righteous cause is his own, and the strong sweep of his anger and his faith is seen in his readiness to risk losing all in the hope of gaining all. A second way is the way of compromise. A willingness to compromise shows that the parties to the quarrel hold one thing as of greater value than the things for which they are contending, and that one thing more precious than all the rest is peace. Or, at least, each of the contending parties holds that a fragment of that for which it strives, together with relief from strife, is better than the chance of gaining all through hard and dubious conflict. Compromise has, no doubt, its rightful place and in the daily dealings of men with men it must play an important part — a larger part, indeed, than we commonly realize. But on the whole it represents a weaker attitude than the attitude of direct antagonism backed up by strong conviction. An age in which compromise takes the leading place instead of a subsidiary and intercalary place, an age distinctly characterized by the spirit of compromise, is not “an age on ages telling” when “to be living is sublime.”

A third method of settling a dispute, a method hard to practice and even hard to define, the method which arbitration ultimately represents and reinforces, is the method of finding some ground of positive agreement higher than the ground taken by either antagonist at the beginning of the strife. In every dispute between honest and intelligent disputants we find some show of justice in each of the conflicting claims. The method of war crushes the claim of one side, with all the good and bad there is in it, and gives victory to the other side with all of its bad as well as its good. The method of compromise takes the course which leads to peace, even though much of the good of either cause be sacrificed by the way. The method of arbitration would seem to be merely the method of compromise through the agency of a third party, but essentially it is more than this. For every well-conducted international arbitration contributes to the building up of a higher conception of international obligations, of world relations, and is accordingly in its effect a bringing of the disputants together on higher and more stable ground than either of them occupied when the strife began. I think this view may be abundantly justified by examples from modern history. There is not time, however, for such illustration, and the bare and general statement must be left to stand alone.

The immediate question is that as to the relation of public schools to the type of thinking which lies back of arbitration procedure. It seems clear that this is the very type of thinking which is characteristic of modern education at its best. It is the type of thinking which should be promoted in schools of every grade, in the interest of liberal culture, rightly understood. It is by promoting such culture and establishing such modes of thought among our people everywhere that the public schools can lay the surest foundation for the arbitration principle.

The watchword of this movement may fairly be taken as the watchword of all modern education, and we may phrase it in the words, *Let us look for a better way*. The spirit which it represents is at one with that of modern science — of that science which is undoubtedly the dominant influence in the methods of modern education. For science, with all of its strength of conviction, holds its doctrines not as records of final attainment nor as banners set up for a battle to the end, but rather as well-laid steps of an ascent. It expects something better beyond, expects to rise above its present knowledge and belief; and in that expectation it is able to look upon any intelligent opposition as indicating the need of finding some higher principle which shall solve the present difference. Even in the lower schools, by ways that are often intangible,

this spirit is making its way. It is not too much to hope that it will become broadly characteristic of the teaching of all of our schools, and when it has become so characteristic of that teaching, the principle of arbitration will be grounded in the educational consciousness of our whole people.

Before we leave this discussion, there are two added considerations to which attention should be called. The arbitration movement looks for its success to the cultivation of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. In the heat of national anger it is too much to expect that any people will welcome from its opponent the suggestion that there are better grounds on which they may hope to meet. If, however, our people have been trained from their youth to recognize in every sharp difference of opinion the possibility of there being some higher and better ground of agreement, undiscovered as yet, there cannot fail to be in time a little greater readiness to appeal to an impartial world, to peoples not involved in the dispute, and to respect the suggestion from without of a better way to an honorable peace. It is here that an increased understanding of other nations than our own may be expected to reinforce the teaching that leads men to hope for a better way. It is not simply that a knowledge of other nations, well taught in the schools, will lead us to consider more

carefully the claims of an antagonist in time of trouble, but that it will prepare our people, or any people, to look with more favor upon an appeal to the judgment of the civilized world.

In the second place, such an appeal to an impartial tribunal would be strengthened in the minds of any people if that people were grounded in some of the fundamental principles of human law. On other grounds than this, it is to be desired that the elementary principles of legal right should be more distinctly taught in our schools along with the principles of common morality. This is not the place to enlarge upon a topic like this, which must be subordinate to the main discussion of this occasion. But it is not out of place to say that those great elementary principles of right and justice which have been the nourishing thought of many of the greatest minds of our race, are in themselves a most desirable element in the liberal culture of all our people. I cannot but think that a people trained to have respect for principles such as these will be so much the better prepared to accept in time of controversy the view that neither party to the dispute is the rightful judge of the cause, but that the cause should be judged by a competent and regularly constituted tribunal which should have no selfish interest in the question at issue.

Briefly stated, then, the contention of this paper is as follows: That the schools of our whole

people may properly contribute to the movement for international arbitration only in ways that contribute to the general purposes of education, but that positive improvements in education are called for to-day in ways that must inevitably reinforce the arbitration movement. Among these ways are endeavors to promote among a given people, as our own, a more intimate and appreciative knowledge of the character of other modern nations with whom this people has to do; the promotion in the schools of that type of thinking which readily passes beyond its partial convictions, no matter how earnestly held, to larger views in which opposing convictions may find their rightful recognition and come to agreement; the teaching in the schools, as a part of our instruction in morals and civil government, of some of the elementary principles of legal justice, which shall enable our people to adjust themselves freely and consciously to the reign of law in all great human affairs. The argument amounts to this, that our education of all the people shall be made at once more scientific and more humanistic in its character, and that the schools shall teach the people in all their concerns to look for a better way.

Let it be added that education cannot be expected to prepare the way specifically for the arbitration of any particular cause. When international irritation has arisen and there is

threatening of war, the work of education for the time is under arrest. Not only the laws but the teachers as well are silent in the clash of arms, or in the clash of temper which threatens an appeal to arms. Our hope is that education may exercise an influence far in advance of the crisis, which shall turn men to some international tribunal before the irritation has arisen to violent anger from which there is no appeal but to arms. Education can do very little to allay the wrath of nations, but it can do much to hold the nations back from uncontrollable wrath while the question is still new and in the balance. The schools cannot prepare to-day for the crisis of this year. They are to prepare to-day for the crisis of ten years hence or a generation hence. But this of itself may be a work of inconceivable significance. And the way in which so great a result may be compassed is the way of making familiar and natural to a whole people, and to possibly antagonistic peoples, a mode and habit of thought, a moral devotion to conceptions of justice and righteousness, which shall give to the advocates of arbitration their chance to be heard and understood.

VII

POSSIBLE CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Contributed to a Discussion in the National Council of Education, at its Meeting at Cleveland, Ohio, July 1, 1908. Published in the Proceedings of the National Education Association for the year 1908, and in The Independent of August 6, 1908.

VII

POSSIBLE CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE EDUCATIONAL ASSOCIATIONS OF DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

THE suggestion which was made to this Council one year ago, that steps be taken to bring the National Education Association into closer co-operation with similar bodies in other lands, was offered in the conviction that the greater part of the work of education in all lands is one work, and that all teachers among civilized peoples have a common cause. There is abundant ground for this belief. The legislative bodies of many nations have found enough of common interest to make possible an Interparliamentary Union, and that international body has profoundly influenced the course of recent history. Yet parliaments are the centers of positive nationalism. We may fairly expect to find more elements of unity in the schools of different nations than in their legislatures. And such undoubtedly is now the case.

The world relationships of universities have been recognized, with varying clearness, for

seven or eight centuries. The earlier development of schools for the people was more closely connected with the rise of modern nationalism. This gave us higher schools which emphasized unity, alongside of lower schools which emphasized difference. Such a distinction of course goes down to the fundamental constitution of society. It cannot be maintained, as a principle of sharp separation, where the distinctions between social classes have been smoothed out or are in the way of disappearing. Nations which have a traditional enmity to keep alive toward some of their neighbors — a memory of ancient quarrels which colors all their history — are at a disadvantage in this regard. In so far as class distinctions persist in such societies, with something of the finality of caste distinctions, a lower class will be taught to hate another people while the highest class is learning to understand other peoples.

But this condition can hardly continue, unmodified, in our modern world. The many care to learn what the few have known. The scientific spirit forbids us to teach in the lower schools what is untrue from the standpoint of the higher schools. Then, there is a New Humanism in the world, which is surely spreading abroad. This new humanism recognizes the fact that to know and understand living men, both individuals and nations, is a great part of any complete educa-

tion. This humanism tinges all of the social and the international striving of our time. It tinges our education. I have had occasion before to speak of one little symptom of it — a straw on the waters of our primary schools — in the wide popularity of that children's book, the "Seven Little Sisters," by Miss Andrews. And for more pretentious indications of the same current you would not have far to seek.

We live already in a world in which men are trying to understand one another. Men are trying to understand their neighbors, and that is the better part of democracy. Men are trying to understand other peoples and nations, and that is the foundation of our new world-politics. The reason why we may hope to understand the rest of the world, the reason why we even care to understand the rest of the world, is that our differences stand out from a background of agreement, a substratum of ultimate unity. The differences are picturesque and interesting, and at times they command the whole field of attention. Without national peculiarities and even oppositions, our world-unity would be a poor thing, a dull and insipid uniformity. But we must not forget that, after all, the differences get their life and worth from that underlying unity. The time has come when men can give attention to the common human purposes of all the tribes of men without suspicion of treason against

their own government. In our own land this is pre-eminently true. As Mr. Stead has said of us, "America is the one great international country of the world."

When Professor Payne of the University of Virginia a few years ago made his comparative study of the public elementary school curricula of the leading culture nations, he found an approximate agreement in the subjects of instruction and in the relative amount of time devoted to different subjects in the schools of representative cities. Aside from differences as to the inclusion or exclusion of religious doctrine, the most important variations were those relating to the language employed and studied and the content of instruction in the national history and literature. Even here the instruction in the schools under consideration might readily be compared with reference to its form and the principles guiding the choice of materials in those subjects. So striking, indeed, was the agreement which his study revealed that Professor Payne was led to make the following remarks:

It is to be feared that our educational theorists have sometimes excused themselves from making a comparative study of these different curricula by an exaggeration of the supposed disparity of aim and the consequent improbability of gaining suggestions of worth. The tables . . . show such a slight difference of curricula in the ele-

mentary schools of the several countries, that it makes one suspect either that the aim of education does not determine what shall be studied, or that the aims of the several countries do not differ as much as has been supposed.¹

And again,

No one can fail to be impressed with the fact that the general principles which govern the selection and arrangement of the subject matter of the elementary curriculum are practically the same in the four educational systems here studied.²

Without doubt, national differences must still be more influential in determining the teaching of the lower schools than that of the universities. In some degree this difference must, I think, be regarded as permanent. A strong nationalism and even a certain wholesome provincialism are to be cherished in those schools. But it is quite as important, and is in truth essential, in this modern age, that the lower schools preserve their continuity with the teaching of the universities and their loyalty to aspirations which all civilized nations hold in common.

I hope that our great National Education Association, in its unquestioned loyalty to our national ideals, may take steps which shall promote

¹ Payne, Bruce Ryburn. Public elementary school curricula. Silver, Burdett and Company [1905], pp. 15-16.

² *Idem*, p. 182. The four educational systems studied were those of the United States, England, Germany, and France.

the good understanding now gaining ground among the nations of the earth. Let us send our emissaries to confer with similar bodies in other civilized lands, as we have so often welcomed foreign teachers in our great annual gatherings. Let us take our part in setting up world-standards in the domain of culture and education. Such a movement, I believe, will make for peace; but if so, it will accomplish that end by promoting one of the best tendencies in modern education, a humane tendency, which may be summed up in the saying, Let us see if we cannot understand one another.

VIII

ARE WE AN INVENTIVE PEOPLE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION?

*An Address before the Vassar College Chapter of Phi Beta
Kappa, June 10, 1907. Published in Science, August 9,
1907.*

VIII

ARE WE AN INVENTIVE PEOPLE IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION?

EVERY invention, I suppose, is made up of individual and social elements, and combines them in a way different from that of every other invention. There is no more interesting department of literary criticism, or æsthetic criticism generally, than that which seeks to trace out the respective contributions of the race and the individual in any work of art. This is illustrated in a recent discussion of the distinction between the folk-epic and the art-epic, the characteristic difference, for example, between the *Iliad* and *Paradise Lost*.¹ Some Homer, in the one instance, whatever his name, gave the final form to a poetic tale that must have been shaping itself in the traditions of his people for many generations. In the other instance, in which we may distinguish the poem from the contemporary materials out of which it was constructed, the work of the poet looms large, and

¹ By Professor C. B. Bradley in *The University of California Chronicle* for June, 1906.

the work of the people back of him is obscured by his personal fame. Yet, when we analyze even Milton's art, with all of its manifestation of a fearless and independent personality, we find it related in the subtlest ways with the literary tradition of his time.

So it is in the history of mechanical invention. We have seen recently a running discussion of the origin of the electric trolley car. This very modern invention is commonly referred for its beginnings to the electric railway first operated at Richmond, Virginia, in 1888. But it appears that that undertaking had a forerunner, and that forerunner in its turn had a prototype, and the successful American inventor is found to be only the topmost figure of a human pyramid, made up of no one knows how many experimenters in this particular field. The Patent Office has difficulty enough in distinguishing each new invention from its patented predecessors. But when we go aside from the series of formal patents and look to the succession and mingling of motives and ideas, the tangle passes our ability to unravel. We can only see how inextricably the stroke of individual initiative is enmeshed in the movements of a whole people, and that very complication we find it a delight to contemplate.

Now, this social character of all invention appears in a peculiarly vital way in any original work in education. For education in a special

sense not only springs from the people, but in turn creates the people from which it springs. Education is its own father. An over-emphasis on individuality in education would quickly carry us away from the line of direct succession. It would give us isolation and sterility instead of re-creating the spiritual life of the race.

One cannot add too quickly that in the nature of things the danger of a dead lack of individuality is usually a more threatening danger. But let us at once get down to our examples. To begin with, we may take the kindergarten. There has hardly been a more distinct and conspicuous invention in the whole history of schools. It is a thoroughly conscious and modern work of art, in which the personal agency of the inventor comes to the fore. That is the very weakness of the invention. To this day it has not been assimilated. In our educational concert it is a voice that sweetly sings in tune but that refuses to blend with other voices of the chorus. There may be different explanations of this lack of accord. It may be that the individual note is permanently at variance with anything that can be made universal. Or it may be that the kindergarten is merely in advance of the age and will bring the rest of education round into adjustment with itself. It seems pretty clear that both explanations are in part correct. The kindergarten, with certain other forces that have worked toward sim-

ilar ends, has brought our elementary education a long way toward its type of faith and practice. Yet the emphasis on what is distinctively Froebelian still keeps it a thing apart, and seems likely to set a permanent limit to its ascendancy.

It will appear, from this reference to the work of Froebel, that we are not now concerned simply or chiefly with those inventions which bear the sharp stamp of one man's individuality. It is a minor consideration that the invention should be known at all as the work of a single inventor. Some of the most marked of immediate successes and ultimate failures have had that distinctive imprint. Such, for example, was the monitorial system, in the forms given to it by Joseph Lancaster and Doctor Bell. Such a system may have a large usefulness of its own in the course of educational progress, but it is as scaffolding rather than as part of the permanent structure. Its very insistence upon that which is one man's makes it less fit to serve the great needs of Everyman.

So in varying degrees the educational inventions of the ages combine the distinct contribution of this or that inventor with the broad tendencies of an inventive people. What are some of the other inventions which Europe has contributed to educational history? I mention only a few of them and with little thought for sequence of any sort. There is the educational system of the Jesuits, particularly in its seventeenth and eigh-

teenth century form. There is the English university, made up of federated colleges. There is the seminar, which has been such an instrument in the making of German university instruction. There are two recent contributions of the Swedish people, the Sloyd system of hand-work and the Ling system of educational gymnastics. Let us add the seminary for teachers, the school garden, the Hilfsschule or school for backward children, the system of higher institutions for commercial education, the Gouin method and various other successful methods in the teaching of modern languages, the English system of university extension. Many others will, no doubt, occur to you. When we come to think over the list, it appears that much has been accomplished, and that European education has not only been greatly widened since the Middle Ages, to reach a manifold larger constituency, but has also been improved to a wonderful degree by the progress of educational invention.

When we would institute a comparison between European and American contributions to such improvement, it is well that we consider first the wider range of invention. The world at large gives to the Americans the credit of being a highly inventive people as regards mechanical devices. The attention of our people was early turned in this direction. Certain conspicuous successes fired the national imagination, and the

stress of economic need drove us to the same end. The Patent Office became a centre of national pride. To take out a patent or buy the right to sell a patented article or at least to buy something with the magic patent label attached thereto, became a well-nigh universal ambition. And in sober truth our record in the making of useful inventions is really wonderful. At first thought and without an effort you can recall the lightning rod, the steamboat, the cotton gin, the whole series of reaping machines down to the latest combination harvester, the sewing machine, the telegraph, the telephone, the arc and the incandescent electric light, the phonograph, and twenty other things that are now counted among the necessities of modern life. It is a dazzling list, and may well make us forget the things we have not ourselves invented, but have borrowed from other lands. On second thought, however, we recall those notable creations, the steam engine, the balloon, the power loom, the locomotive engine, the daguerreotype — first-fruit of modern photography, — the spectroscope, wireless telegraphy, and many others that the wit of Europe has devised. However much we may lead in the number and variety of our cunning contrivances, there is enough for which we are indebted to other lands to check our conceit and assure us that we have competitors.

On the whole, however, in the domain of

mechanism we are undoubtedly in the lead. The fact that the number of patents issued annually in the United States is now only a little less than the whole number issued in all of the rest of the civilized world is not without significance. But when we turn to creative literature and the other arts the case is changed. Here the leadership rests with Europe. We have done good work in this field and are rapidly doing better, but not yet with that confident leadership which we display in mechanical invention. Many of the best short stories are ours. We have a score and more of writers of creditable verse — and even Europe does not seem to be over-productive of great poems in these days. We are producing some virile sculpture that is not merely imitative, and our painters can now command the respect and admiration of the world. The superiority of our illustration art is recognized. We are erecting many good buildings and are producing some good music. But, after all, the preponderance of inventive excellence in these departments is still conceded to Europe. Our architects study at the Beaux Arts, our musicians at Leipsic and Berlin, and our young painters are known to the world when they have exhibited at the Paris Salon.

How, then, does it stand with us in the field of education? I think any one who reads in the German pedagogical literature of our day has

now and then a sense of hopelessness of any educational originality. The range of its suggestion is in fact astounding. The new plan and conception of educational procedure which is just dawning above his horizon is very likely to appear in some German pamphlet or even in some "Handbuch der Pädagogik" as a familiar notion, the boundaries of which have been well marked out and its values weighed in the balance. So any one familiar with the stream of educational influence which has long been crossing the Atlantic in our direction will proceed with caution in naming our American contributions to educational invention. Yet it will be admitted that pedagogic discussion in Germany and in other countries of Europe often outruns by far the practical embodiment of ideas in working institutions, and even the great reach of German educational doctrine still leaves some things to the educational makers of other lands.

The Europeans themselves are generous in giving us credit for the origination of a variety of educational contrivance. Among the particulars in this bill of credit have been mentioned the American school of library practice, the kitchen garden, the high school laboratory for instruction in natural science, co-education in secondary schools and colleges, the combination school of the Pratt and the Drexel Institute type. It is difficult for us to form a list of our own. We are

too close to the facts to be sensible of their distinguishing characters, and besides we know that Europe has many surprises that might trip us if we claimed too much. But at a venture I would suggest the following as among our original contributions to education, making no claim, however, that the list is all-inclusive or even includes all of the best that we have done.

First, the non-sectarian elementary school for all classes of the community, answering to our democratic social organization and our religious liberty.

Secondly, the American high school, serving at once as a continuation of the elementary school and an introduction to the higher education, with courses meeting a variety of tastes and needs.

Thirdly, the American university, with its combination of instruction and research, of cultural and technological courses, and with liberal and professional departments often dovetailing into each other. To this might be added that notable invention, that new development of personal efficiency, the American university president.

To these institutions, at the core and center of our educational system, we might easily add a number of minor features of that system, no one of them insignificant in itself. The summer school may be mentioned, with its home-study development, as in the Chautauqua type; the text-book in its better forms, and the better type

of instruction based on the use of the book; the college gymnasium, for physical education; the consolidated country school, with provision for the transportation of pupils; the organization of public libraries and museums in close connection with the work of public schools. How many others there are that come crowding on the attention! One is tempted to mention Helen Keller as one of our most admirable educational achievements. The story of her training into normal and honored womanhood is one of the most stimulating passages in our educational history. And Tuskegee is another. Then, too, we recall our schools for the training of nurses, which in a very few years have come to enroll twenty thousand students annually. I may speak of another example, which falls within my own sphere of labor, for as a new invention it was the work of my honored predecessors. I refer to that special type of industrial training which is connected with the introduction of domestic reindeer into Alaska.

In that northern country the necessity of making some better provision by which the natives might clothe and feed themselves, was the mother of this combined industrial and educational invention. Reindeer were imported from Siberia. Teachers were brought from Lapland. And the Eskimo were set to the lesson of caring for the deer, of breaking them to the sled, of using

them in profitable service of the incoming white population; and so of adjusting their lives to a new industry, by which they might maintain themselves in the face of new conditions which threatened their very existence. Here was a truly constructive treatment of a most difficult racial problem. A new industry was fitted to new conditions and a new education was based on that new industry. While the arrangement has not yet shown what its full development may be, it has become well established in these more than fifteen years, and already it has made its place and proved its usefulness.

But we cannot fairly estimate the measure of our inventiveness unless we turn to the other side, and see what are some of the defects in our system which we have left uncorrected. These are the points where our educational invention has thus far failed to do its work, and they are neither few nor unimportant. I think it will appear that all along the line, from the bottom to the top, our educational system, the object of so great national pride, is still marked by serious inadequacies.

We have not yet made any great improvement in the nurture of children at home, up to the kindergarten age or the age of the primary school.

We have not yet brought the kindergarten into full adjustment to our educational system nor devised any adequate substitute for the kindergarten.

We have found ways of keeping one half of our pupils in school up to the sixth or seventh grade, but we have not found ways of keeping all of them to the end of the elementary course.

We have not yet organized nature studies in the schools into any well-knit adjustment to general education.

We have not yet carried our instruction in drawing up into fully effective training for the fine arts, in secondary and higher schools.

We have not yet brought our religious education, as carried on in Sunday-schools, into any effective parallelism with the secular instruction of the public schools.

We have not yet brought our normal schools into satisfactory adjustment with our cherished sequence of schools from the kindergarten to the university.

We have not yet wrought out a satisfactory arrangement for the training of teachers for secondary and higher schools.

We have hardly as yet established a permanent teaching profession.

We have not devised adequate means of giving needed cultivation, æsthetic, intellectual, and moral, to the individuals who make up the student body of our mammoth universities.

We have yet to work our way through the gaseous, centrifugal atomism of our college elective courses into an organized and unified national culture.

We have not yet achieved a national standard in our academic and professional education, nor have we organized any effective and economical co-operation among our schools of graduate instruction and research.

We have not yet devised ways by which public education can be definitely and adequately focussed upon the improvement of our national morality.

The list, again, is by no means complete, but it is surely long enough for the purposes of this discussion.

I do not take a pessimistic view of the situation in which these defects appear. In every one of the particulars enumerated, serious efforts toward improvement are making even now, and we cannot doubt that full success will ultimately be achieved. There have been devoted teachers who have labored long for such improvement, and in some instances their accomplishment has been great and beneficent. But that our triumphs in these particulars have been local and exceptional rather than permanent and national, will be generally agreed, and it is well that we look this unwelcome fact in the face.

We may now attempt a direct answer to the question which was asked at the beginning, Are we an inventive people in the field of education? We are, unmistakably, an inventive people in this field. It can hardly be doubted by any one who

looks upon the exuberant Americanism of our elementary schools, the great expansion and continued readjustment of our secondary education, the growth of our universities and of university influence in ways that catch so exactly our national characteristics and turn them to academic ends; nor can it be doubted by any one who watches from year to year the spread of our education into new fields by new and untried processes. We are inventive in our education, but it is not yet clear that we are pre-eminent in this regard, and our educational invention still lags far behind our invention in the domain of mechanism.

We may easily be misled by the flattering reports of foreign visitors. With all of their frankness in pointing out our defects, their general criticism of our schools is for the most part extremely favorable. But we must not forget that education with us is in the sweep of a strong tide of popular sentiment. Every invention that we have put forth is carried forward by that current and finds opportunity to do, in full swing, its destined work. Not that individual inventors do their work unhampered and with no discouraging delays. That could never be. But, by contrast with Europe, the way of educational improvement here is direct and clear. We cannot yet fairly judge what our education would accomplish under greater difficulties and in the face of closer

competition. It is safest for us to take the moderate view, and hold that our educational successes thus far, great and glorious as they are, are only great enough to confirm our hope and confidence, and not yet sufficiently great to insure to us the ultimate leadership.

Our inventiveness in this field is less conspicuous, as has been said, our education shows less of readiness to seize obscure suggestions and carry them through to unlooked-for triumphs of efficiency, than that which we have long disclosed in our Patent Office reports. Yet this field is at least as interesting as the other. It makes intense appeal to widely differing minds, and public attention is often drawn to new educational projects in a measure that is truly astonishing. What is needed is that that public interest should be more sustained and more discriminating; that the inventor in education should have the unfailing stimulus which has goaded our mechanical inventors to their most strenuous endeavors. And on the part of the inventor himself there is need of all the patience and resource of the designer of new mechanism; and of other qualities, subtler far than these, which it may be worth our while to consider at this point.

The inventor in education does not bring before the people a new object which they are to look upon and admire and use. The people are the very stuff of his invention, public sen-

timent is his atmosphere, he is an artificer of human society. Accordingly he must have, many times over, the patience of the mechanical inventor. He must be willing to merge his fame in the larger life of the invention. For if it is a real and living invention he will find that there are many collaborators, and it may take generations to bring the design to its perfection. In education it is generally true that an invention that is only of one man size is not large enough to last. Yet the work calls for zest and courage, and there is ground for individual encouragement. Social changes are accelerated in these days. The single generation has, more than ever, its chance of striking an arc of appreciable advancement, and there was never a time when one man in his one earthly life had a better chance of doing some work of noble note. I believe the spirit of educational invention can be quickened among the men of America, to meet the larger demands that are upon us. And if this language seems to spread out shield and spear in the household of Lycomedes, it is not that I am seeking Achilles at Vassar. It should be said rather that the highly educated women of America are themselves to have a most important part in this educational quickening. Indeed, it is not too much to hope that the time is at hand when our men and women will take share and share alike in this work — alike but different. And we may

trust and pray that the great work that our women are already doing in every phase of social improvement may not cause the men of America to dream that their responsibility can be shifted, but may rather remind them that they must not fail in their part.

It may be well to enter here upon some brief discussion of three or four of the problems now calling for constructive leadership. In the first place, let us make note of an unfinished movement, which demands our best skill and will surely reward its exercise. It has been said that the education of the school and education by apprenticeship, after centuries in which they have gone apart, are drawing near together in these days. It seems fair to expect, in fact, that the school of the future will be the result of their union. The combination appears in many forms. Most familiar of these, up to the present time, is the school laboratory in the natural sciences. Here instruction from the book assumes a subordinate place and the pupil learns by what he does. Already, too, the method of the scientific laboratory is permeating other departments of the school. It has influenced the teaching of history and the languages, and we may even see its influence extending to the teaching of law in the professional school. But now the school and the apprentice system are drawing together in other ways. The movement is obvious in manual training and domestic education.

The actual contact of the two systems, however, has been especially marked in the past two years. At the Carnegie Technical Schools in Pittsburg arrangements have been entered into by which boys will take a part of their training for certain trades in the ordinary course of apprenticeship, under the control of the trades unions, and another part of their training for the same trades in the technical schools. At the University of Cincinnati the experiment is making of combining work for wages in a regular shop with the studies of an engineering course, two young men counting for one in the shop by alternating on one-week shifts, each taking his university studies in the week that he is not at the bench. The experiment is watched with the liveliest interest by both shop men and university men and thus far it gives promise of success. In the movement toward the establishment of public trade schools, now under way in Massachusetts and Connecticut and in several other states, the relation of the apprenticeship to the school is a question of the utmost importance, both educationally and in its connection with the problems of trades unionism. From a general pedagogical standpoint the combination of the methods of the literary school with the methods of apprenticeship seems one of the most promising of present opportunities for the exercise of educational invention.

May I venture, in the second place, to speak of the present problem in the higher education of women? I will not say what I think about the subject here and now, when I am so happily indebted to your generous hospitality. I do not think you would care to have me indulge in the language of compliment. But before I came to Vassar, let us say, the question of woman's higher education in America seemed to me to lie about as follows: That, after the great advance we have made in this field, which has commanded the attention of the world and the admiration of a good part of the world, we have come to something like a standstill, and some of the most important steps have not been taken as yet. It has taken a great struggle to establish fully the higher education of woman as a simple human need. But that battle has been won. The integration of woman's education with the general scheme of education has been brought about. But the differentiation of woman's education is yet to be accomplished. Let us admit that the task of integration was by far the greater task. But does it follow that the differentiation is no task at all? Or, to put it in other words: The functions of men and women in society are different in many ways. Do those differences lie wholly beyond the range of education? I am confident that they cannot permanently be left outside of the range of education, but the task

of bringing them under educational treatment is one of the greatest difficulty. It calls for the highest exercise of inventive skill and patience. In co-educational institutions, under a system of free election, the problem tends to solve itself by the gravitation of women toward certain courses and of men toward certain other courses, while still other courses are common ground. But this solution is only partial and unsatisfactory. Some practicable scheme of preparation for mother-work will, we cannot doubt, be devised in the course of time. There will be, some day, an education for home making and for woman's leading part in the finer forms of social intercourse, which will do on the higher academic plane what was done in a more petty way, generations ago, in popular finishing schools for girls. But this, too, is only a part. There is to be, further, a serious preparation for woman's work in the economic, the industrial, and even the political world. What the all-round solution of this problem will be, I cannot tell nor even guess. But if it meets the need, it will be an educational invention of the highest order of excellence.

In the third place, there is the international organization of education. Commissioner Draper has recently called attention to the tremendous number of men and women engaged in teaching throughout the world to-day. There are not far from three and one-half million of

them, according to his estimates. And for the most part they are engaged in what is essentially the same work, wherever they may be. The full realization of the unity of this great body of teachers, when it is attained, must have profound consequences for the peace and civilization of the world. Already we are working toward such unity in a number of definite and special ways. Many of these ways are already familiar to all: The visits of teachers and other educational leaders of one country among the schools of other peoples; systematic efforts of one people to spread a knowledge of their culture and ideals among other peoples, as exemplified in the *Alliance Française*; the exchange of university professors; and a variety of other procedure.

If the diplomatic relations of nations have passed into an economic stage, it should be added that they are passing into an educational stage. Mr. Barrett, the chief of the Bureau of American Republics, urges, with good show of reason, that if we wish better commercial relations with the proud and sensitive peoples of South America, we must first meet them on higher ground, through an understanding and recognition of their culture and education. Already we can see signs of the emergence of world-standards in school education and university education and particularly in professional education. It is an

immediate and practical need that we put our higher education into shape to deserve, and by deserving to compel, recognition, the world over, of our academic and professional degrees. All of these things call for new procedure, new devices, and new co-ordination of existing agencies. That is, in the language of this discussion, they call for a new exercise of educational invention in its very widest range.

Finally, the international need emphasizes the national need. Such a thing has happened repeatedly in the history of international relations. What we must do to take and keep our place among the nations of the earth, reveals to us what we must do at home. No one in his senses, I am sure, would propose a centralization of American educational systems. But we need as never before an effective co-operation of our state educational organizations, and of our institutions of learning under more private forms of control. And when education is spoken of here, the meaning is education in its widest reach, from the elementary schools through the colleges and universities, from the most general to the most special of its developments, through the several forms of professional instruction, through organized scientific research, through our provision for libraries and museums and those movements which promise for us the making of a really national art. The organization

of what may be called our national education in a manner suited to the spirit of our institutions and in forms commensurate with our standing among the nations — this is an undertaking which must tax the imagination and make demand for administrative originality such as the academic world has seldom seen. But it is a work that is to be done. And it will undoubtedly be the work of many men and women, brought together in intense co-operation, and be extended far beyond the limits of a single generation. It will be a work of national invention.

Such, as it now appears, is some small part of the task that lies immediately before us. It is a work that may well call for the most serious consideration of this greatly influential society, which aims to make its philosophy a guide into the larger life. The plea which has been offered amounts in sum to this: That by all means you will give encouragement and stimulus and discriminating criticism to our already awakened spirit of educational invention; for it takes no second sight to perceive that the times call for the exercise of that spirit in the highest things to which it may aspire.

IX

CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES: SOME OF THEIR NEEDS

An Address delivered before the International Congress on the Welfare of the Child at Washington, March, 1908. Published in the National Congress of Mothers' Magazine, June, 1908.

IX

CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES: SOME OF THEIR NEEDS

THE President of the United States, in assigning to me the high honor of coming before you as his representative, expressed his deep and serious interest in your undertaking. To promote the general welfare by way of a betterment of American childhood is, as I understand it, the main object of your activities. It is a purpose which, in an especial degree, commands the President's warm consideration. In this solicitude all patriotic Americans must share. And whatever wise measures you may initiate to carry your high purpose into effect cannot fail to find a response in all groups and sections and parties of our American people.

In particular, as a schoolman and a member of the National Education Association, may I express my personal gratification that the Mothers' Congress is to be one of the organizations to be represented in the new Department of National Organizations of Women, which was authorized by the directors of that association at

their meeting last summer in Los Angeles. The educational program of these several women's organizations is so well framed, and so much may be done by them to make that program operative in our educational systems, that your participation in our great National Association brings to it a promise of heightened usefulness. It is to be hoped that you may find your new relations with that association altogether helpful and congenial. May you be greatly successful in the educational projects to which so much of your effort has been consecrated. And may your meetings here in Washington happily further your plans for making a joyous childhood universal in this land, as the best introduction to an honorable manhood and womanhood.

Your purpose is, indeed, the broad purpose of our civilization. We are seeking to make a childhood of wholesome play lead up to a mature life of wholesome work from which the spirit of play has not been altogether lost. We think it worth while to provide for childhood with its play. We think it worth while to provide in a thousand ways for the work of grown-up years. But just at this time we are chiefly interested in the passage from the age of play to the age of work. That is the focus of some of our most anxious thought of to-day. The school is largely concerned with the transformation of a playing child into a working man with some of the play

still left in him. So the question of which I speak is the question of the fitting together of the later years of school with the earlier years of work. Here is one of the most penetrating questions of our time, and one to which you may fairly devote your most earnest planning and study.

It may not be necessary to show the danger of too abrupt a change from one mode of life to another. That danger has been often remarked. For example, it has been noted that the German system of higher education, under which a student passes at one bound from the close prescription and supervision of the gymnasium into the unlimited freedom of the university, is a system which subjects many a young student to an overwhelming moral disadvantage. Many lives are undoubtedly wrecked in that first year of unaccustomed liberty. On the other hand, the German points to the hard lot of the American volunteer in time of war. Without preparation of any kind he is plunged from a life of peace into the hardest realities of a military life. It cannot be denied that physically and morally many young men have gone to pieces under such a strain. But what is to be said of a boy in his teens or a girl of the same age who in one day passes from a life in which there is no work to a life that is all work? The physical strain of such a transition is great, but the moral strain is worse. Yet exactly the strain of such sudden

change is what we have to guard against in the interest of great numbers of our people.

Where our population is densely concentrated and the struggle for a living is hard, where industry is organized in enormous units, in factories and mines, and laborers are counted by the thousands or the tens of thousands, there the danger rises to its highest pitch. In a more scattered population and under industrial conditions of an earlier type, the danger is less threatening. There, in many individual instances, we may still see the passage from school and play to grown-up life and work accomplished in ways that are wholesome and very good to contemplate.

It is natural for us to go back in thought to the course of our own lives. I trust I may be pardoned, accordingly, if I appeal for illustration to my own personal recollections. They take me back to a childhood on the farm and in a country village in northern Illinois. Before I was ten years old my village life had begun. Before I was eleven the ambition was moving me to take some share in the family burdens. I could see already that those burdens were pressing heavily on the father and mother. Our family life was an intimate one. We were all partners in the family fortunes. I had my regular round of small duties, known as chores, but I was eager to earn money and pay my part of the costs. So it came about that it was my own desire and no urgency what-

ever on the part of my parents that made me a wage-earner in my eleventh year. After anxious searching and inquiry I found employment in the village, which did not interfere with the hours of school; in vacation time I began working on neighboring farms; and before the year was out I had assumed the full responsibility of keeping myself in clothes. By a happy provision of nature, as I grew taller and it cost more to clothe me, I grew also stronger and my earning power increased. It was a proud moment when my wages were advanced from fifty to seventy-five cents a day.

At a later time the home place grew larger, and I was needed there to do my part with other laborers. So I ceased to earn an independent income, and once more I was clothed from the family purse. Thus, with various alternations of work and schooling, and later with short terms of teaching school, the time went on until I was prepared to enter regularly upon my chosen profession.

It was a happy life, on the whole. There was a fair amount of play in it, and I enjoyed the play a good deal more than the work. But there was interest, too, and pride in the work. The rest of the household were doing their part. There were warm neighborhood relationships. And in the home there was music and reading, with table-talk of politics, history, religion, and the daily news.

It is plain to see that mine was not an isolated case. In many parts of the country it may be duplicated with ten thousand variations to this day. Numerous records parallel with this, to all intents and purposes, may be found in the Congressional Directory. And if *Who's Who* gave biographical details concerning the first twenty years in the life of each of its inmates, such instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely.

Let me repeat that the point to which attention is here particularly directed is the overlapping, or let us say the dovetailing, of school life with the life of a wage-earner and producer. Such overlapping belongs to certain years between the ages of twelve and twenty-one. Leaving out of consideration now that small percentage of our people for whom schooling is still the main occupation of life for some years past the age of twenty-one, and speaking only of that greater number who have gone over to a life of labor before they have reached their majority, and many of them long before, I would present for your consideration this view: That for that larger proportion of our number ways should be sought by which their school life may be dovetailed into their life of toil. For one or two years at least, and preferably for a longer time, after the law permits them to work for pay, some part of their time should still be reserved for school. The ways by which this may be accomplished will be various, and some

of them are still to be discovered. But, by whatever ways may yet be found available, we must seek to prevent the sharp break from school life to a life of hard and unremitting labor, which is now too often the lot of boys and girls at the fourteenth, fifteenth, or sixteenth year of their age.

The more gradual and irregular transition of which my own boyhood is an ordinary example is in some ways better than any arrangement which can be deliberately provided, on a large scale, by legislation and administrative procedure. But in some ways it is not so good. There are surely methods to be found by which a closer interaction may be brought about between the schooling and the labor. Each may be made to give support to the other. Our national inventiveness should be equal to the demand for educational adjustments to meet this rising need. Already, in fact, such devices have begun to appear. In the great agricultural states of the West, many boys and young men are dividing their time between farm work in summer and studies in agricultural schools and colleges in winter. In the cities there are robust and ambitious young people who, even after full days of labor, give their evenings to attendance on evening schools. There are department stores in which a part of the time of the younger employees is given to school pursuits in school rooms provided by their employers. At the University

of Cincinnati and the Carnegie Technical Schools in Pittsburg, young men and boys divide their time between an apprenticeship in the shop and theoretical study in the class room. These varied experiments may be regarded as the skirmish line of an advance which is to be of great significance for our national character and well-being. It is not too much to hope that laws may be devised and plans of organization carried into effect that will make a midway period, in which part schooling is required and part time labor is permitted, one of the most fruitful periods in all the educational years of youth. I do not look to see such a movement fall short of this consummation: That for all of our people there shall be schooling of some sort and in some amount through all the years up to the age of twenty-one; and that this schooling in its later years shall have a more intimate bearing on the duties and occupations of life than we have yet been able to accomplish.

But while we hold such hopes and expectations in all confidence, it is not to be forgotten that the immediate task is that of securing wise laws for compulsory education, joined with compulsory abstinence from unsuitable wage-earning work. There is clearly this need that the right to an education and freedom from those industrial conditions which would ruin the good results of education should both be provided by law. Of

our forty-six states, thirty-five have now on their statute books laws varying greatly in their scope, for the accomplishment of both of these purposes; on the other hand, one state has no laws for either of these purposes, and nine have either child labor laws or laws for compulsory education alone. The District of Columbia is not a satisfactory model for the rest of the country, for its improved statute for compulsory education is not yet matched with a statute for the regulation of child labor. This is a gap which it is hoped the present Congress will supply.¹

Now, taking account only of those states in which there are both compulsory education laws and child labor laws side by side, let us note the relation between the close of the compulsory education period and the beginning of the permissive labor period. Some of our child labor laws assign different ages for different occupations, and none of them apply to all possible occupations. But speaking broadly, the present status of the case is about as follows: In eighteen of the states these two points coincide, that is, full-time employment is permitted the day after full-time compulsory education ceases. In one of the states there is a gap of two years between the two. For many children such a gap is a period of danger, a much more serious danger, indeed, than that of the sudden step from school to gainful employ-

¹ Congress has passed a child labor law since this was written.

ment; for children who may not take employment for wages and are not required to go to school are subject to all of the evils of enforced idleness at an age when impulse is strong and control is weak and characters are ready to take their bent for life. In seven of the states this danger is met by a provision extending the age of compulsory school attendance in the case of children having no regular employment. In the remaining seventeen of these states there is some form of overlapping of the compulsory schooling age and the permissive employment age. In these seventeen states there would seem, even at the present time, to be a fair opportunity for judicious experimentation with ways of making a better transition from the school to the work of life.

More and more, however, it becomes clear that statutory provisions in these matters are not effective without well-developed systems of inspection and enforcement. And if the best things are to be brought within reach, the enforcement of compulsory education laws must go hand in hand with the enforcement of compulsory non-labor laws. Such combined efficiency is absolutely essential if the ends of which I have spoken are to be attained. With adequate guarantees on the sanitary and the educational side, it would be practicable, for many children in the middle of their 'teens, to place the school alongside of the factory or the shop, even under the same roof, and

to have the pupils divide their time between the two. It is conceivable that such an arrangement might be made of incalculable advantage, not only to industry but equally to education. But it should not be considered for a moment without those adequate guarantees. In every way it would appear that any great progress in these matters is dependent upon a full and harmonious development of our systems of enforcement. It will be safe to make the laws flexible, to adapt them to a great variety of conditions, in proportion as their administration becomes exact and dependable. To strengthen these provisions on the administrative side is accordingly one of our chief concerns at this time; and this is notably the case, I may repeat, if any such intimate combination of industry and education as is here proposed for a transition period is to be made a safe and sane and practicable undertaking.

Passing now from this more special consideration of the transition period in the lives of our future workers, permit me to remind you of the present urgency of the whole problem of our school attendance. After all of the efforts that have been put forth — compulsory attendance laws, varied attractions in the studies offered, and public opinion pressing upon indifferent parents — our school attendance is still far behind what it should be. At a fair estimate every one of our people should receive at least eight years of school-

ing of approximately two hundred days to the year. As a matter of fact, we fall far short of this standard. In the year 1905 the average schooling per individual of the population for the whole country was only 5.33 years. In the North Atlantic Division, including the New England and Middle Atlantic states, this average went as high as 7.09 years. In the South Central Division it was only 3.06 years. In both cases it was far too low, and it is evident that a great task is still before us to bring this amount up to anything like the point that it should reach. When we try to realize the meaning of the figures, to understand how many children have been kept from their educational inheritance, we are oppressed with the waste of warm, human life and opportunity which such a showing signifies. Yet the figures offer encouragement, too. While the present averages are painfully low, they represent a long-continued improvement. The showing of an average of 5.33 years of schooling per individual of the population in the year 1905 should be set over against an average of 3.96 years in the year 1880. This advance of 35 per cent within the term of twenty-five years is a notable gain when we remember that the total number of persons to be educated had increased at a rapid rate within the same period. In the South Central Division, which shows the lowest average at this time, the improvement has been notably rapid, amount-

ing to 65 per cent within this twenty-five-year period.

When we turn from the figures for broad sections of our land to a closer examination of representative cities, we find both stimulus and encouragement in another form. Here we have the significant tables recently prepared by Professor Thorndike to show the dwindling of public school classes from the lower to the higher grades of the school. The showing here is disheartening if we consider only such facts as these: That one-half of the pupils, generally speaking, have left school before the eighth grade is reached, and only 40 per cent go through to the end of the elementary school. But when, on the other hand, we see what progress some of our cities have made, we take new courage for the rest. While in the mean or average the cities show over half of the pupils dropping out before the eighth grade is entered, twelve cities out of twenty-three already carry more than half of their pupils through the seventh grade, seven carry more than half of them through the eighth grade, and two, at least, carry a majority of their pupils through the ninth grade and over into the high school. There is reason, then, for solicitude, and reason as well for hope.¹

¹ Since the above was written, Professor Thorndike's results have been sharply criticised, but even the figures presented by Mr. Leonard P. Ayres, one of the keenest of the

What one city or a few cities have done other cities may do. This is the word to be passed on to those parents' associations in connection with public schools which the Mothers' Congress has promoted — a form of association of the greatest promise in the way of educational improvement. All manner of co-operation and moral influence must be added to all manner of legal and administrative compulsion to bring about the desirable uplift of our schools in this matter of attendance. But such combination of favoring influence has even now accomplished notable improvements, which have been seen and measured and recorded. So much the more may we expect that the efforts of the immediate future will have their wished-for reward.

The point cannot be too strongly emphasized that the importance of these various statistics lies in the human values that they represent. We are concerned with the difference that it makes in a human life to have eight full years of schooling in a good school, as compared with three or four fragmentary years in some half-organized makeshift for a school, or even less than that and with no school at all. We are concerned with these values in individual lives, and we are looking beyond to the great interests of the com-

critics (Laggards in our schools, pp. 66-72) show only about fifty per cent of the pupils completing the elementary school course.

monwealth and the nation. As regards school attendance and child labor and all of those high interests to which your organization has devoted its attention, these human values, these state and national interests, come before us with compelling power.

These interests cannot fall short of a national significance, for it is the oncoming citizenship of the nation with which they have to do. The nation cannot look with unconcern on those things that affect its fundamental character and endurance. It is not my purpose here to discuss any of the ways which have been proposed to give effect to the national concern in these matters through governmental action. I shall do no more than express my conviction that this national concern is too deep and genuine to fail of finding suitable expression. It is not to be supposed for a moment that the nation will do aught to weaken the hands of the states in dealing with the present situation. But the nation has much to do that will strengthen the hands of the states, and will work to the betterment of that great body of young citizens who are the hope alike of the states and of the nation.

The great need is that the opportunity for sound growth and education shall be equalized for our children and our youth throughout the land. If opportunity is the very thing that our democracy means, then we must realize democ-

racy, as far as possible, by making the opportunity of the child born in one part of the land as fair and encouraging as that of the child born in any other part of the land. This, in large part, must be the responsibility of governments, both state and national. But as preparatory to governmental provisions, and as holding the ground till governments can act with full effect, there is a great work to be done by private and co-operative agencies. And when governments have done their best there will still be large responsibilities devolving on such agencies. Your influential society and other women's societies that share in these undertakings — they can do much to further that equalizing of opportunity which our America still so sorely needs.

Thus far we have considered the interests of children in the United States with reference, first, to the connection of school life with life in the world of work, and in the second place to the whole question of attendance upon the schools. Before I close may I go back to that earlier and still more difficult problem, which has been given a prominent place among the aims and purposes of this Congress, the problem of preparation for mother-work? I would not venture to advise you with reference to an education which should fit women for their part as mothers in the home. That is a high theme in which others may learn from you. What I should like to urge upon

your consideration is a narrower and lowlier calling, yet one which may conceivably become of large significance in the life of our people.

Under modern conditions there is need for a great deal of mothering by those who are not mothers themselves, a need for foster-mothering, if the term may be permitted. In orphanages, in day nurseries, in social settlements, in homes from which the mother has been taken, or in which the living mother is unable to carry all the burdens of her position, there is to-day a wide demand for the services of young women who are expert in the care of little children from the first month of babyhood to the age for kindergarten or school. This demand is met for the most part by those who have had no special training for the task, because such special training is nowhere to be found. We have trained kindergartners and trained hospital nurses. Some little beginning has been made in the training of nursery maids at babies' hospitals. In Ghent and Paris and London there are schools for mothers among the very poor. But none of these exactly meet the case. What is proposed, in effect, is this: That as in recent years the profession of kindergartner and the profession of hospital nurse have been created, so now another new profession for women be established, the profession of babies' nurse or nursery governess. As a profession it would require its

training schools, its professional literature, its societies maintaining a professional spirit and atmosphere. The training would, in part, resemble that of the hospital nurse, in part it would draw near to that of the kindergartner, in part it would be different from either, a special training for this new profession alone. A leading place should necessarily be given to the care of the little ones' health and particularly to the problem of nourishment. But there should be a place, too, for the principles of baby education, which might consist mainly of the prevention of too much education and the securing of a healthy nervous system, capable of standing the strain that school life will put upon it in after years.

There is, however, no need to elaborate details, for these in any case must be supplied for the most part by the teaching of experience. So far as the main contention is concerned, I am persuaded that there is room for this new profession and that it will quickly make a place for itself as soon as a school for such training is provided. In commending such a plan to your consideration let me add that the largest usefulness of schools for foster-mothers would undoubtedly come in time to be their indirect service — their returning wave of influence upon that subtler and more difficult preparation for real motherhood. That there should be schools and a profession in which the varied knowledge

needed for the care of the youngest children is regularly assembled and communicated — such a circumstance could not fail to have the deepest interest for mothers everywhere, who have the most intense and personal desire to know what may be known for their children's good. To give form and coherence and practical effectiveness to the knowledge of baby life and the life of the little child, even though it were done in the first instance for the training only of nurses, would be in the end a service rendered to all motherhood.

It is with the greatest diffidence and deference that I bring these few suggestions to you, upon whom the real responsibilities and honors of mother-work have rested. You will undoubtedly devise wise and liberal things for the children of our land, for no one feels their needs more keenly than you, or seeks more earnestly to supply those needs. Knowing the full weight of anxious care for your own, you have learned to care for the good of all those who are under the simple, common, universal need of childhood throughout the land. And we who must bear those burdens in other ways come to you, deeply mindful of all that the ministry of mother and of wife have meant in our own homes, and look to you with confidence for help in those large undertakings for the welfare of all children with which our state and national governments have to do.

X

TRAINING FOR MOTHER-WORK

An Address delivered under the title, The Relation of the Home to Moral and Religious Education, before the Religious Education Association at its Meeting in Rochester, New York, February 6, 1907. Published under that title in the Proceedings of the Association, and under the present title in The Independent, April 18, 1907.

TRAINING FOR MOTHER-WORK

EVERY improvement in education involves many factors, and, in the discussion of the plan proposed in this paper, I shall find it necessary to make occasional digressions with a view to noting some of the attendant circumstances which seem to me to condition any successful experiment in the field we are to consider.

I find it necessary, in fact, to begin with a digression. Attention should be called at the outset to the extreme difficulty of making effective any really new departure in education. Every new educational process or institution shows in a marked degree the same conservative tendency which made the first railway coaches take the form of the stage-coach, which they superseded, until they had developed slowly and painfully new forms of their own; the tendency which made some of the earlier experiments in the use of iron and steel in architectural construction take the form of columns and pilasters cast in the mould of the old Greek orders. This tendency to as-

simulate the new to the old, in such a way as to delay or even defeat the purpose of the new, takes on a special phase in the domain of education. The success of the school depends upon the teacher. When a new type of school is projected, there are generally at hand few teachers, if even a single teacher, who possess the requisite combination of training, experience, and a clear conception of the new purpose, to do the new work effectively. The problem of bringing a new educational plan into full force and effect is accordingly the problem of getting the new purpose clearly in mind, and then of providing the requisite training and apprenticeship for the teachers who will do the work. So far as the teachers are concerned, the difficulty rises even to a difficulty in the second degree; for if the new work is to be widely extended, one must consider not only the question of the supply of teachers, but the question of providing teachers of teachers.

For reasons which will appear later in this discussion, I should like now to limit my topic to a very small division of the general field. For the present, let us leave altogether out of consideration the great majority of our American homes, in which the burden of the earliest physical care and moral and religious training of the children will rest almost exclusively upon the mother of the family, and concern ourselves simply with

those homes in which a children's nurse or governess is employed. That is, I should like to consider the question at first merely as a question concerning the training of nurses for very young children. At first sight, it will seem that this is limiting the question to one affecting the homes of the rich. I should say rather that it is limiting the question to one affecting the homes of the rich, motherless homes, and the homes of the very poor; for with the development of a great variety of college and neighborhood "settlements" in our large cities, and with the increasing clearness of educational purpose in institutions for orphans and other unfortunate children, the range of employment for such children's nurses as I have in mind will undoubtedly be very greatly extended. In this we find a parallel in the history of American kindergartens. Before the kindergarten becomes a part of the public school system, it exists in two forms: as an institution for the children of the rich (the "pay" kindergarten) and an institution for the children of the very poor (the free kindergarten). In more ways than one, indeed, the plan which I am venturing to propose will have somewhat the character of a downward extension of the kindergarten into the earliest years of the life of the child.

But this is not all. It is to be remembered that the moral education of very young children

is most intimately bound up with their physical welfare. In fact, the question of survival and of physical health must be kept at the front in this earliest period, and the beginnings which are made at this time in the cultivation of a generally wholesome disposition, and of those regular habits in eating, sleeping, and related activities which have much to do with the welfare of the nervous system, are at the same time both physical and moral. It is accordingly desirable that in training for this service we should break away from the narrower traditions of the kindergarten. Many good precedents may be drawn from the training of nurses in hospitals and sanitariums, but even such precedents must be used with caution.

It is to our purpose, however, to note the encouragement which may be drawn for such an undertaking as this from the history of the education of nurses in this country. Within the memory of those here present, the nurse called in to help when the household had been invaded by long-continued illness was either a neighbor or a servant. Except in a few hospitals, the trained nurse, as we now understand the term, was unknown. The occupation was lacking in definite standards. Those who followed it lacked professional spirit or other *esprit de corps*. Now these conditions are rapidly changing, and the schools for nurses are bringing about the

change. In the year 1901 there were 448 of these schools reporting to the Bureau of Education, with an attendance of 11,599 students. Five years later, these numbers had increased to 964 schools and about 20,000 students. These schools are rapidly advancing their standards of admission and of scholastic and practical training. Already the best of them are worthy of attentive study from the point of view of our normal schools, because of their handling of the persistent normal school problem, that of the union of theory with practice. The nurses have their associations, their periodical and other publications. In ten states laws have been passed for their registration. In the state of New York, in particular, under the administration of the department of education, the course of training provided in different schools has been unified and strengthened. If nursing is not a profession as medicine is a profession, it has come to have something of the professional character and spirit. And the public is greatly the gainer by the change.

It is one great merit of a vocational school of any kind that it stamps this professional character upon the occupation for which it prepares. By professional character, I mean that ingrained regard for standards and ideas, for special knowledge and special skill, which marks the professional man; and his readiness to put the claims

of public service and of intrinsic excellence of performance above considerations of private gain. As compared with any kind of apprenticeship, a vocational school makes for such professional spirit, by combining the instruction of specialists in different fields, by referring processes to guiding ideas and cultivating practice in its connection with theory, by organizing a coherent course of training, by making a center of information relating to recent improvements in its particular craft.

Not only does the school prepare for the vocation more quickly and more thoroughly than any ordinary form of apprenticeship, but it tends to improve more rapidly in its methods and appliances. If schools for nurses of the sick have raised an irregular occupation into something so like a profession as we have seen them do within these few past years, it seems not incredible that schools for the nurses of little children may do as much within as brief a period. It is the establishment of such schools, or of special courses for this purpose in universities and other institutions, that is proposed in this discussion.

The difficulties to be met in the making of such schools are undoubtedly very great. The baby nurse of to-day is ordinarily a servant, and often a foreigner chosen because her speech is that of Paris or Hanover. It would seem as

if the superficial demand were for the right accent rather than for skill in the care and nurture of the little ones. The real demand is for a variety of knowledge and of judgment. Nutrition, the prevention of disease, proper care in minor ailments (for the nurse for the sick must be the main reliance in serious illnesses), the correction of faults of temper and disposition, the first steps in learning, supervision of games, the telling of stories, the first hint of the mysteries of religion — the range of such requirements is very great indeed. And since the service required is part physical, part educational, part maternal and spiritual, there is no one professional superior who shall guide the practice of the infant nurse. She is not, like the nurse of the sick, a physician's assistant and under the immediate guidance of the family's medical adviser. She must take her directions and advice, first of all, from the parents, if they are at hand to direct; but also from the physician, the pastor, if there be a pastor, perhaps the teacher, if the family has taken the teacher into such close relations with its inner life; and, most of all, must take counsel with herself, and draw on the resources which she has made her own.

No good movement ever had a beginning. No matter where we may start in, we find that it is already begun. I have been unable as yet to find notice of any existing institution which exactly

fills the rôle which is suggested in this paper. Yet the beginnings have undoubtedly been made. Professor Charles R. Henderson has called my attention to two institutions in Paris which are at least closely related to such training schools as are here contemplated. One is the *École des Mères*, which was founded by Mme. Augusta Moll-Weiss at Bordeaux in 1897 and removed to Paris in 1904. This school provides a section for professors and women of the higher classes; a second section for women intending to enter household service as nurses, cooks, etc.; a third section for women of the working classes; and a fourth section for instruction in domestic economy and management of the home. Its purposes are extremely varied. It is intended to prepare young women directly for duties as heads of families, to prepare others to become teachers of domestic economy, and to give instruction to working women in such economic and ethical principles as may be of importance for them to understand, in practical hygiene, sanitation, etc.

Another Parisian institution is known as the Consultations respecting Nurslings (*Consultations de Nourrissons*), and is conducted by Professor Budin of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Paris, in connection with the maternity section of a Paris hospital. These consultations are intended to give to young

mothers practical information respecting the nourishment and care of their infants.

My attention has also been called to an extremely interesting article in the *Nineteenth Century* for December, 1906, by a member of the Women's Co-operative Guild, on the "Ghent School for Mothers." This school, conducted by Doctor Miele in connection with the Bureau de Bienfaisance, was started about five years ago, and is evidently carrying on a work of the greatest interest. The services which it renders include dispensaries for babies, a milk depot, health talks to mothers, a course of training for girls, and also some theoretical instruction in the care of infants and practice in a number of crèches.

In an open letter relating to "Unskilled Mothers," Mrs. Florence Kelley, in the *Century Magazine* for February, 1907, tells of the Association of Practical Housekeeping Centers, which was incorporated in the City of New York in February, 1906, and does a valuable work in the homes of the poor of Manhattan and Brooklyn. Incidentally, Mrs. Kelley tells in this letter of the instruction provided by the County Council of London for school children in cottages altogether similar to those in which they live. One of the Mosely party of teachers who recently visited the Bureau of Education has given further information with reference to this cottage instruction. It is carried on in the neighborhood of an

elementary school, and gives to young girls practical experience, under conditions much like those found in their own homes, in the ordinary duties of housekeeping.

The Englishwoman's Year Book and Directory for 1903, the latest issue I have at hand, contains notices of the Sesame House for Home Life Training and for the Training of Kindergarten Mistresses and Lady Nurses, at St. John's Wood; and of the Norland Institute in London and the Liverpool Ladies' Sanitary Association, at both of which "ladies are trained as nurses for children."

Coming nearer home, we find at the Babies' Hospital of the City of New York a training school for nursery maids which has been in operation for the past sixteen years. The recently published report of this hospital, for the year ending September 30, 1906, contains interesting information with reference to this course of training. At the time of this report, there were 27 pupils in the school. The course of instruction and training covers the subjects of infant feeding, bathing, hygiene of skin, nursery hygiene, training of children in proper bodily habits, miscellaneous subjects, nursery emergencies, and the rudiments of kindergarten work. Thirty-four nurses were graduated from this school in the class of 1906. The following additional information concerning the school is conveyed in

a very interesting letter recently received from the secretary of the medical board of the Babies' Hospital, Doctor L. Emmett Holt:

The girls received are from twenty to twenty-five years of age. The course is eight months; six in the hospital and two months in private families on probation after leaving the hospital. Nurses receive \$7 a month during their training. There are trained annually about thirty-five nurses. Nurses receive after graduation \$25 a month the first year. After this most of them receive \$30. The applications for nurses are greatly in excess of the supply and are often as many as one thousand in a single year.

Doctor Holt adds that nurses are trained in a somewhat similar way at the following institutions:

Infants' Hospital in Boston;
 St. Margaret's Home, Albany;
 The Babies' Hospital, Newark, New Jersey;
 St. Christopher's Hospital, Brooklyn;
 ThePittsburg Home for Babies, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania;

and that there are other similar schools in San Francisco and Buffalo. I have, however, no further information with reference to these other schools.

The New York Evening Post of December 26, 1906, contained a notice of courses which are given by the Harlem Young Women's Christian Association. These courses, it seems, are intended for the training of "kindergarten nurses." To be admitted to such courses the girls must

be more than eighteen years of age and must have had a high school education or its equivalent. A certificate is awarded at the end of four months of satisfactory study, but the full course is eight months in length.¹

There are doubtless other experiments which are in the making and have not yet come to my knowledge. It will be found, I think, that the ground is prepared for such an undertaking as has been outlined above. But what has thus far been done is in the nature of pioneering, of scouting as it were, and the real systematic advance is yet to be made. It may well be believed that the time for such definite advance is already at hand.

Just what is to be attempted and just how it is to be accomplished are not altogether clear. But these things seem clear at least, that the training to be given should join theory with practice, and that the work must be partly pedagogical and partly parallel to that of the ordinary nurses' training school. For the purposes of

¹ There has come to my notice, since the above was written, a most interesting volume of over five hundred pages, entitled "L'éducation domestique des jeunes filles," by Louis Frank (Librairie Larousse, Paris, [1904?]). Chapter III, on "La science des mères," contains interesting information concerning schools somewhat similar in character and aim to those here proposed. The author speaks warmly of the "kitchen gardens" devised in this country some twenty-five or thirty years ago by Miss Emily Huntington.

practice, it seems desirable that the student should have access to a babies' hospital, a foundlings' home, a day nursery, or some other institution in which there are children to be cared for. The theoretical instruction can probably best be given in connection with a college or university. The difficulty of working out any standard course of systematic training is obvious, yet is no greater than other difficulties which have been met and overcome in the course of our educational development. The problem is accordingly referred to the departments of education and of hygiene of our women's colleges, and of universities to which women are admitted, in the confidence that, like Sentimental Tommy, they will "find a w'y."

I look to see the problem ultimately solved by such institutions as these, in co-operation with hospitals and other institutions for the actual care of infants, rather than in institutions of the latter class apart from colleges and universities; for the training which is here proposed is educational in its relationships and purposes, and is intended to attract young women whose preliminary training fits them at least for admission to the higher institutions. It may, indeed, be found that the demands of practice will so far outweigh other considerations as to make it necessary to conduct all of the courses in connection with the institutions where the babies

themselves are to be found, rather than in the class rooms of the ordinary college. None of the effort which may be put forth by institutions other than colleges and hospitals to this same end will be lost. The widest experimentation will be needed, and the labor of the pioneer, in this as in other fields, will be not only necessary but also deeply interesting.

If I have said nothing as yet of the training of mothers, on whom the care and culture of baby children must chiefly rest, it is because such training is particularly difficult to compass by any direct approach. However much young women may look forward, in a wholesome way, to the responsibilities of motherhood, I believe the most of them would shrink from any course of training intended expressly to prepare them for those responsibilities. If such an attitude commonly appears, we may declare it to be unreasonable, but we must reckon with it as a fact. It is, indeed, an attitude which finds some justification in simple human nature. It seems to me very doubtful whether a course in school or college expressly intended to fit young women to be wise mothers of little children would have much chance of success. But I do believe that a professional course, intended to fit young women for the vocation of children's nurse, would have a much better chance of success. It is reasonable to expect that when such courses are well started they

will be largely attended, and that those who have taken them and received certificates or diplomas showing that they have pursued them successfully, will find employment in abundance awaiting them. Still further, it is not unreasonable to hope that when the vocation of baby nurse or nursery matron or whatever it may be called, shall have become a well-established profession, its influence will spread abroad in many desirable ways. Some of these graduates will become teachers of classes of young mothers in college settlements and Young Women's Christian Associations. Many of them will marry and will carry their knowledge and skill into homes of their own. Some young women, already betrothed, will take the course of training with no other thought than that of fitting themselves for the homes that are to be theirs. And it may be that the special course will gradually lead the way to some more general form of education for the life of the home, which may find its place and do its beneficent work in all our schools and colleges for women.

If I have said little in this paper of the religious side of the training here proposed, it is not that I regard the religious side as of subordinate importance. But in these earliest years, it is surely desirable that any over-emphasis of the religious consciousness should be carefully avoided. The simple and sincere suggestion of religious

conceptions which may safely be attempted should be joined with an equally wholesome mental and physical life, and particularly a life of wholesome companionships, which is the best assurance of all right-mindedness in the later years of childhood.

XI

THE WORK OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZA- TIONS IN EDUCATION

Read at the first Meeting of the Department of National Organizations of Women of the National Education Association, at Cleveland, Ohio, July 2, 1908. Published in the Proceedings of the Association for the year 1908.

XI

THE WORK OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS IN EDUCATION

FOR those who wish to see the National Education Association represent our educational interests in the broadest way, a peculiar significance attaches to the launching of this new department. An educational work of large significance and varied character, already in full progress, is here brought into connection with the comprehensive undertakings of this Association. While the responsibility for the establishment of the new department is widely shared, I should like at this time to recall in particular the part taken by Miss Mary N. Abbott, of Watertown, Connecticut, who shortly before her death had been laboring with great faith and devotion, to bring about the arrangement which has here been consummated. I saw her but once, when she was devoting her best energies to this undertaking, and I had never known her aside from this enterprise; but I was much impressed with the really religious earnestness which she brought to her task. That spirit, I am sure, is shared by many others, and it gives promise that this depart-

ment is to be one of the most useful branches of our general organization.

In the beginnings of modern schooling, a great deal depended upon the labors of unpaid organizers and overseers, mostly women, whose benevolent spirit found in the support and improvement of schools its best way of discharging the responsibility of the well-to-do toward the poor of their neighborhood. Those who have read that interesting work, *The Gurneys of Earlham*, by Augustus J. C. Hare, will recall the conscientious devotion to the education of the poor displayed by different members of the Gurney family, and particularly by its most conspicuous member, Mrs. Elizabeth Fry. There is much of the same sort to be found in the personal histories of eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century England, and the same spirit reappears in the early education societies of our American cities, in New York, in Boston, and in Philadelphia.

In both England and America the upgrowth of well-ordered systems of public education threw endeavors of this kind into an eclipse. In place of schools supported, with the greatest difficulty, by private subscription, there appeared schools established by law and maintained by taxation. Teaching became both a professional occupation and a branch of the civil service. The responsibility for everything educational, at least

for everything in the nature of public and organized education, was shifted to a body of professional servants of the commonwealth. The educational societies went out of existence, as did the American Anti-slavery Society when the thirteenth amendment to our Constitution was adopted. The contributions and the benevolent activities of those who had carried the burden of schools were transferred to other charities. Education had simply ceased to be an eleemosynary and missionary enterprise, and had become a part of the ordinary administration of state and local governments.

Now, it is plain to see that, while education gained a great deal more than it lost by the change, the loss was real and serious. Fortunately, the professional teachers who took up the educational burden were themselves human as well as professional. Some of the finest devotion to the welfare of little children and to the wider purpose of the public weal appears to-day in their activities. It is necessary to their best service that as they become more professional they should become more than professional, and many of them have come up unfailingly to this higher plane. But it takes large natures to carry out so large a program, and it is not surprising that it has been done with varying degrees of success. The best teachers of all see most clearly this need, that new ways shall be found of bring-

ing to the support of the modern public school some of those finer forces of our community life that once made the school and kept it alive.

Matters which lie wholly in the field of science — the method of constructing a bridge, of testing our milk or water supply, of combating an epidemic, of determining a question of legal right — these things are professional; and extra-professional interference in such affairs would do more harm than good. In education, too, there is a large field of professional knowledge, in which interference by the general public or even by a board of education representing the public, could only do more harm than good. Within its limits, the professional judgment of the trained and experienced teacher is to be more scrupulously respected to-day than ever before. Not a book should be placed in the school library nor a picture on the schoolroom wall, no society, no matter how good its object, should be formed within the school under pressure from without, no special method nor device of teaching nor of government should be imposed upon the school, unless it have the approval of the teaching force within the school.

It is when we come into the field of morals that every man is responsible for a judgment of his own, and cannot shift it to the shoulders of another. And education in one of its main aspects is essentially a question of morals. It is a ques-

tion in which the professional point of view cannot pre-empt the whole field, and in which the non-professional citizen is morally bound to have opinions of his own. Every public question, in like manner, has a moral side. The building of bridges, the conduct of dairies, the practice of the physician and the attorney, these are questions to which the common citizen cannot be indifferent.

We have then a large range of activities in which the professional teacher should clearly have the right of way, and an equally clear outlying territory, of great importance, in which we are dealing, not with professional responsibility but with moral and community responsibility. And these two are fringed in together in an intermediate shadow-land where some of the most vital questions of to-day are found.

This new department deals with that outlying field and with that indeterminate shadow-land. Its relation to the schools is non-professional and moral. It is to further a return to the side of popular education of those benevolent and missionary endeavors which were once the main support of popular education. But we are to remember that in the intervening years the spirit of the benevolent missionary has changed. The spirit which did things for others for their good has been transformed into the spirit which does things with others for the common good. In this old spirit, renewed and remade, it is to be hoped

that the department you have inaugurated may become a rallying point for those good influences in our communities which seek to find ways of working for and with the common schools.

It is right that women should lead in this cause. They have shown capacity for such leadership. But it is to be hoped that men and women alike who desire that the non-professional responsibility of our communities for public education shall be adequately discharged — that all of those who have a mind to make education of more worth in their communities than it has been at the best hitherto — shall know better what to do and shall do it with better courage for the enlightenment which this department can give.

You will not expect my suggestions to take the form of a detailed program of topics for your consideration. Much of your work has already been blocked out by the societies that are here represented. Much of it must arise to meet the special need and occasion. The general platform on which you had met by common agreement before this department was organized, embodies a number of the most important proposals for educational improvement on which the friends of education generally are agreed. In these matters your work is that of bringing into effective prominence a number of improvements in which at least a passive unanimity has already been secured.

I should like, however, to indicate a general line of advance in the educational affairs of our larger centers of population, a plan which is extremely simple and yet must be regarded for the present as somewhat visionary. I should like to see all of the teachers organized for the consideration, from time to time, of definite proposals for the improvement of the schools; and all of the parents of school children organized, with other interested citizens, for a similar purpose. Without hampering our educational authorities in any of their ordinary work, and without relieving them of their ultimate responsibility for all of the work of the schools, an informal and habitual referendum might well be agreed upon, under which all proposals for far-reaching changes in the plan of education should be considered at length by these two independent bodies. All manner of conference and co-operation between the two should take place, and certain committees of conference and certain other organizations should include teachers and parents on equal terms.

Endless delays should, of course, be avoided; but by some such arrangement as this we might be reasonably sure that no sweeping change should be made in our systems of education till it should be fairly well understood by those who, next to the pupils themselves, are most concerned with the experiment.

But such an arrangement should not only prevent sudden and ill-considered change. It should prevent long-continued and equally ill-considered lack of change. We need to keep the spirit of invention alive in our school systems, for new times call for new measures. In both of the bodies to which I have referred the spirit of initiative should be fostered. In education as in other fields the great majority of new inventions fail and ought to fail. But the hundredth one or the thousandth, that is a thing of great price. Let the body of non-professional friends of education be one in which a premium is placed upon suggestions for improvement and reform. Let fair consideration be given to suggestions of this kind. If they are widely approved, let them be passed on to the body of practical teachers for a second approval, or for modification or rejection. Or let the procedure be turned about, as the occasion may demand. But let us through this means have, from year to year, proposals sent up to the education authorities which shall represent not merely the half-baked enthusiasm of some bright leader who has won a sudden following, but the conviction of those who have looked into the matter with care and conscience, some of them from the side of what the community wants, and some from the side of what the schools can do.

My own suggestion, as you see, is none too thoroughly wrought out as yet, and it has not yet

run the gantlet of either a body of teachers or a body of friendly neighbors of the school. I hope it may have criticism, however, from both of these sides. And I venture to put it forward here as one of the many proposals for the good of our education which you are to discuss to some good purpose in this first meeting of your department.

XII

THE DISTINCTIVE FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITY AND NORMAL SCHOOL IN THE PREPARATION OF TEACHERS

*Read at the Meeting of the National Council of Education
at Cleveland, Ohio, June 30, 1908. Published in the
Proceedings of the National Education Association for
the year 1908, and in Education for September, 1908.*

XII

THE DISTINCTIVE FUNCTIONS OF UNIVERSITY AND NORMAL SCHOOL IN THE PREPARA- TION OF TEACHERS

WHAT I have to present may be summed up as follows: The chief difficulty of adjustment from the side of the normal school arises from the fact that the normal school seems to be out of the main current of our scholastic life, which flows from the elementary school through the high school directly into the university or, the other way round, from the university to the secondary and elementary school.

The chief difficulty of adjustment from the side of the university arises from the fact that it has been found impossible as yet to organize in the university any system of training in the actual practice of teaching that can be compared in efficiency with that to be found in our best normal schools.

We are now well accustomed to the idea that all grades of education in this country are to be closely bound together, from the lowest to the

highest. Our fidelity to the spirit of democracy requires this of us, and we are convinced that it is best in the long run both for science and for the national life. Continuity and coherence are watchwords of our educational organization.

But just because the higher grades of instruction are bound fast to the lower, we see the need of especial care that a steady progression shall be maintained in both the method and the content of our teaching. No grade of instruction shall be allowed to lay a detaining hand of scholastic custom and inertia upon the grade above it. At no stage of our scholastic ascent shall we tarry for more than two years with instruction of essentially the same type or the same grade of difficulty.

Furthermore, we cannot be content with the standards of the past. Not only our own national development, but, more particularly, our closer touch with the rest of the world, has shown us that our standards have been pitched too low. This is true both on the side of knowledge and on the side of skill in teaching. In our new position in the world it is not enough that we win patronizing approval of our science and of our school instruction from the older culture nations. That new position requires of us that we do our full part in determining what the world-standard shall be, both in pure science and in pedagogic practice. This is particularly

difficult when half our teaching force is a rope of sand and when the profitable pursuits of applied science are luring our scientists away from their laboratories. But these unfavorable circumstances cannot relieve us of our responsibility; and a consideration of the higher attainments which the present times demand, as regards both knowledge and teaching skill, has an important bearing on the distribution of function between normal schools and universities.

We are pretty well agreed that the knowledge of subject-matter and skill in presentation are both requisite in all grades of teaching, and that, broadly speaking, the skill is of greater relative importance in the earlier grades and the knowledge in the later years of schooling. A general recognition of this fact works automatically in the distribution of teachers, tending to place the graduates of colleges and universities in high school positions and the graduates of normal schools in elementary grades, with a fair mingling of the two in the principalships and teaching positions of grammar schools. Making allowance for many exceptions, I think we should be agreed that the public good is fairly well served by such a distribution. We must recognize the fact that high schools, of the type and standing now expected in our high schools, must be mainly taught by those who have had collegiate or university training. The same should be said of the

seventh and eighth grades of our grammar schools when they are taught on the department plan or offer studies of secondary grade.

We need to get special knowledge and special skill into their right relations to each other, and a third element must be added, namely, special inborn fitness for teaching. The considerations which we have before us, then, range themselves about as follows:

It is of first importance that we attract into the business of teaching and into our training schools for teachers those who have the right stuff in them, the right kind of manhood and womanhood, for such work.

It is next in importance that these persons shall be well educated, as regards both general culture and special knowledge of some one subject or group of subjects.

Close after these requirements comes the requirement of technical training for the processes of teaching.

President Alderman remarked, in his recent paper on *The Growing South*: "The ability of this generation to recognize education as something larger than mere learning or even discipline, to perceive it as a great force moulding national character, has caused the enlistment into this field of work of young men and young women of creative capacity and exalted character, who, under other conditions in Southern history,

would have instinctively turned to political and social fields of distinction and service."

Such a condition is of the utmost importance for the teaching profession and for teachers' training schools of every kind. It can be brought about only through the concurrence of the whole set of conditions surrounding our educational system. All that can be done, by co-operative action of all persons concerned, will be needed to turn toward education, in the country at large, those who can best do the work of education.

The second requirement, that the teacher be well educated, is emphasized here for two reasons: First, because a teacher needs such a grade of education as will give him an assured place with the best educated people in his community, and so give to his influence in the school room the added weight of the respect of the community; secondly, because the teacher needs such a standing with his pupils that his influence upon them will outlive their days of schooling. There is a kind of skill in teaching, adequate and successful according to the standard of immediate requirements, sometimes markedly successful, which nevertheless is without depth, and so falls flat when it comes to the need of a lasting influence in the grown-up lives of those on whom it has been exercised. It is particularly unfortunate when it happens, as sometimes it does happen, that the most distinct and conscious

moral impression is made by a teacher whose skill in teaching is not balanced by impressive and substantial scholastic attainments, a teacher who has become a pathetic memory and nothing more when his pupils have reached their maturity.

The third requirement, that the teacher shall have mastered the art of teaching, is likewise emphasized here for two reasons: First, that his lack of skill may not come between him and his pupils, or indeed come between his pupils and their rightful education. The Apostle Paul, you remember, boasted that he did not frustrate the grace of God. And secondly, that the young teacher, particularly, shall be able to go into team-work with the rest of the teaching force. There is something pitifully lonesome for himself and hampering to his fellows in the position of a highly educated teacher who has not enough of pedagogic interest and teacher-training to enable him to join hands with others in making the school a school.

Now let us come back to the actual difficulties of present adjustment. A normal-school president said to me not long ago, "If you want to do anything for the normal schools, help them to get out of the blind alley in which they find themselves." It was only another way of stating the difficulty which was mentioned at the outset of this paper. Another, a teacher in a normal

school, put it in this way: "Personal relations within the school are good, but intellectually we are starving." I am well aware of another side to the case. Individual presidents and teachers of normal schools have made their institutions fairly a-tingle with intellectual and æsthetic interest. Strong teachers continue to go into the normal schools, many of them bearing the higher degrees of the most advanced universities. But the blind-alley exists, not as a fault but as a situation. It appears in other unattached professional schools, in schools of medicine, of law, and of theology. It may be doubted whether an adequate remedy is to be found in empowering normal schools to offer collegiate courses and give collegiate degrees, though that plan may be justified where a full course of collegiate grade can be provided without detriment to the wider work of the institution. The obvious remedy is to bring the normal school into more intimate relations with the institutions in which the highest scientific work is done, to give it an appropriate place in the university system of its state. Just how this is to be done in any given case, I am not prepared to say. The cases are extremely various. The present disposition on the part of our universities to break the undergraduate course in two at the close of the sophomore year, suggests that in some instances the normal schools might profitably offer, along with their

other courses, the first two years of the college course. One incidental adjustment which seems worthy of consideration is a regular and systematic exchange of instructors between the normal school and a university or certain universities. Such an exchange, when it settled into an accepted routine, would, I believe, have advantages for both of the sides concerned.

The second difficulty of which I spoke, that on the side of the university, is the difficulty of providing suitable practice teaching, particularly in schools of secondary grade. This difficulty has been partially met, in a variety of ways, at Harvard, Brown, Chicago, and California Universities, at Teachers College, and other institutions. It does not seem to me that it has anywhere been fully met. It is comparatively easy to provide practice teaching of a grammar grade or in laboratory courses in the high school, but for high school class work outside of the laboratory, it is more difficult. The normal schools, by their successful organization of practice teaching of an elementary grade, have set a standard of practical training. And strong city superintendents and high school principals are demanding, with good show of reason, that they shall not be required to do the breaking-in of high school teachers, when the normal school accomplishes the breaking-in of teachers for elementary schools.

In the main it seems to me that university authorities have not yet taken this problem seriously. Yet it is, I am persuaded, a problem which will have to be taken seriously. It is to be hoped that closer relations between normal schools and universities may lead to wider experimentation in this field. I do not look for an altogether satisfactory outcome, however, till the matter has been taken in hand by some of our state legislatures. In a serious way, as part of the educational system of the state, the professional courses of our universities must, it would seem, be supplemented by regular provision for special high schools organized expressly as schools for practice teaching; or by apprentice teaching in designated high schools, after the manner of the German *Probejahr*; or by both of these provisions with others added thereto.

XIII

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL INTEREST

Read before the Department of Superintendence of the National Education Association at its meeting in Chicago, February 25, 1909. Published in the Proceedings of the Department, 1909.

XIII

INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL INTEREST

THERE can be no doubt that industrial education is needed to perpetuate the prosperity of our industries. This aspect of the case has been widely discussed, and may simply be taken for granted here.

The point to be chiefly emphasized at the present time is that the great, dominant need of the United States as regards education is the same now that it has always been. It is the need of a body of citizens who are free, through intelligence and self-control. The main business of American education for the future as in the past is the training of our people to genuine freedom. And that means a training to intelligent self-direction in the paths of righteousness. We still believe that such training is possible, and that it is worthy of our best endeavors.

Does this imply that special training for the industries is unimportant? Far from it. New wine may not be put into old bottles, but old wine must often be put into new bottles. The

old spirit of our education must pass over into new forms of education to meet our present needs. In dealing with this newer education, we must have due regard for sameness and due regard for difference. Let us speak of difference first. There is danger that our new, industrial education will be made so like the older education that its distinctive values will be lost. If we are not exceedingly careful, that will be the result where industrial courses are organized in the old schools. We may get simply the old book-and-laboratory education masquerading as industrial education. Such a fiasco is by all means to be avoided, even if we have to make new schools in which the new training may fully establish its different character.

Let us next take account of unity. If we can fully secure the requisite difference, there is great gain in having the new courses organized in close connection with the old. We emphasize thereby the unity of our people in all of their classes and employments. But if the new training must to some extent go into separate schools, let us by all means keep those separate schools in the closest spiritual connection with our general system of education. The special schools need such connection, and the general system needs it equally. A technical training which produces mere manual skill is not what we want. We want a technical training that shall

educate. If our trade schools seek only to cultivate skill, they will not contribute to the improvement of our industries; they will simply turn out superior machines for a stationary industry. On the other hand, if our general education does not eventuate in skill, it will give us a scholastic class, who can only look helplessly on the progress of an industrial life in which they have no part, as Sir Galahad in the castle gazed upon the procession of the Holy Grail.

The bond of unity between general culture and training for a trade is the later development of our conception of general culture. We are familiar with that form of culture which takes one out of the limitations of daily life by means of ideas and associations which are remote from daily life. This is the liberal or classical culture in its various forms. Such culture is everlastingly justified; and a training which has no power to lift the learner out of the pit of present sense and experience can be only a truncated and inorganic fragment of an education. Where vision fails the people fail. But that higher culture, too, is only a part, and it may work a painful isolation of its possessor. Now we are finding ways of seeking out the hidden fire — the world-sentiments and world-ideas — forever latent in the plainest every-day life. When we have gone farther and have made every common environ-

ment yield up its inherent educational values, then the connection between scholastic culture and the trades will be confirmed and realized.

Should the state concern itself with industrial education as herein set forth? I think it will be under the necessity of so doing, in some measure, both for the sake of its industries and, still more, for the sake of its citizenship.

Should the national government have a part in the undertaking? That is a more difficult question, but the answer may still, I think, be in the affirmative. The nation cannot be indifferent, it cannot but have the liveliest interest, where both its industries and its citizenship are concerned. From the beginning it has contributed to the furtherance of education in the states, largely by grants of lands, but in the case of the agricultural and mechanical colleges by annual grants in money. This policy has been abundantly justified in its results. Its extension to schools of a somewhat different grade or character would be so slight a change that it could not be called a departure from our governmental traditions.

But any far-reaching measure in this direction should be taken with due care and foresight. It should not be taken at all if the matter can be adequately cared for by the several states. In any case it should not be taken in such a way as greatly to disturb the various state systems of

educational administration. A careful examination of those systems, as related to the proposed plan for national subventions, should be undertaken, and the federal government should proceed in the matter only in such way or in such ways as will strengthen the hands of the state educational authorities.

Many interests, other than governmental, are profoundly involved in the industrial education movement. They must be considered in all fairness, but from the public and national rather than any private point of view. We cannot direct the industrial education in rural schools simply to the end of keeping young people on the farm. Young people in the country should have their fair chance for any honorable career, in city or country. But country life, too, should have its fair chance to make its legitimate appeal to these young people as well as the life of the city.

The point of view of the employers of labor must be carefully considered, for the wisdom which the direction of great industrial concerns may have taught. But we must not permit industrial education to be directed solely to the increase of production. That would be to subordinate citizens to industries. Broad-minded employers are among the strongest opponents of so short-sighted a policy.

The point of view of organized labor must be

carefully considered. However much objection there may be to the methods of any particular labor organizations, it is plain to see that organization is better than disorganization on both sides of the industrial world. Here, again, the public good is the supreme consideration. We cannot willingly permit the policy of trade-unions to keep any number of our young citizens permanently barred from preparation for some honorable manual occupation. On the other hand, we cannot willingly permit industrial schools to be directed to the disorganization of labor. The relation of school training to apprenticeship in industrial education calls most urgently for fair and thorough investigation and for many and varied adjustments.

And now, just here, we come to the main purpose of this paper. The national problem of industrial education must be solved by a co-operation of industrialists, politicians, and educators. But the chief burden of the solution will be carried by one or another of these three classes. The men of business and the men of politics wield tremendous forces and bear tremendous responsibilities. They are entitled to the respect which these circumstances command. But it is of the utmost importance to our national life that our educational profession shall be found worthy to take the lead in determining the course of our industrial education.

The public will be guided by our best judgment in this matter, if it shall appear that the school men and women are they who take the broadest, fairest, most genuinely progressive view of our position and our needs; if they make some approach to unanimity in their attitude toward the newer proposals, which shall not be simply an immovable and unintelligent conservatism nor an equally ill-considered stampede in the new direction; if they devise wise and practicable plans for new undertakings, not asking large outlay for hasty ventures, but standing vigorously for well-thought-out plans of improvement. If these characteristics shall be manifest in the teaching profession of this country in the face of the present situation, the solution of the problem of industrial schools will be an educational solution. And that, from the point of view of national interests, is devoutly to be desired.



XIV

THE ART OF THE TEACHER

An Address delivered at the Graduation Exercises of the Winthrop Normal and Industrial College, at Rock Hill, South Carolina, June 2, 1908, and before the Department of Pedagogy of Wellesley College, October 17, 1908. An earlier draft of this Address appeared under the title, The Fine Art of Teaching, in The Educational Review for November, 1898.

XIV

THE ART OF THE TEACHER

IT is a very simple message that I have to bring you to-day. I wish to talk with you about the ordinary work of teaching school. We are spending a great deal of time and thought and money in this country in carrying out a large educational policy. But that large policy and those large expenditures all come back to this, that we are trying to put good teachers into the schools and get the pupils there for them to teach, and then to make sure that their teaching shall be done under such conditions as shall give them the fairest possible chance. What a few of us may do as regards general policies is a necessary circumstance. What the teachers and their pupils shall do in the schools is the main thing and the real thing. As soon as you begin your chosen work of teaching, you will be in the very thick of the conflict between light and darkness, between Ormazd and Ahriman; and some of us, in supervisory offices and bureaus, must look on from a distance, with now and then a pang of regret that we cannot share, at first hand, in your toils and triumphs. For my own

part, I am sure that some of my most cherished recollections are those of the school room in which I had the daily teaching of every-day boys and girls.

There are many sides of teaching that we might talk about, but I shall speak of only one. For my text I am indebted to a great Carolinian and Georgian whom I knew as a great Californian, that venerated teacher, Joseph LeConte. In one of his discussions of education as a science, Joseph LeConte gave a clew to the understanding of education as an art. It is this education-art that we are to consider to-day. I mean education as one of the fine arts, having much in common with others of the fine arts.

Professor LeConte, in the paper I have mentioned, used these words with reference to the methods of education: "Artificial they must ever be; for education is art, and art must idealize, not merely copy nature. But, like all art, it must be strictly based on nature. It must adopt the methods of nature and improve them."

The first thing, then, that we are to note at this time is that the fine art of the teacher deals with real things on their ideal side. Natural science insists that we shall see truly, that we shall see things as they are. But art goes further and tells us that we shall see most truly when we see things at their best. Mr. Barrie has put it in one of his stories, "To see the best is to see

most clearly"; and then he adds, "it is the lover's privilege." But the true teacher is a lover of children, and it is his privilege to see the best in them, even the best that is not yet, but may be brought into being. So a clear-eyed teacher knows how faulty at their worst his children are, how dirty they are and silly, how unpleasant in habits and dispositions. But he knows it without knowing it.

"Be to their faults a little blind,
Be to their virtues very kind."

That is his wisdom for every day. He does not complain much of the naughtiness of his pupils. But he has a genuine glow of appreciation for their better qualities and for their promise of future attainments.

"Come and let us live with our children," is the version often given to the familiar saying of Froebel. But one who exercises the lover's privilege of seeing the best will be discriminating in this regard. He will draw near to his pupils, but on the higher rather than the lower planes of their being. This is what Froebel himself did and what many another teacher has done. They drew near to their pupils, not by frivolous condescension to any mere childishness, but rather by leading those children into the uplands where they were themselves at home.

Have you never seen a teacher talking easily and naturally with his pupils on higher themes

than those with which they had been familiar — choosing his time, when their disposition was prepared for such approach, and choosing his words, that the things spoken might not be too easy nor yet too hard? And have you not seen those pupils strive and strain to reach that higher ground, unwilling to disappoint the teacher's confidence or lose the new sense of higher powers which he has awakened within them? It is a rare sight; but it may be met with if you look for it, in crowded primary schools of our great cities and in out-of-the-way country districts all over the land. There is real education in looking up and in reaching after something a little beyond our reach. We know it very well from our own experience. You cannot guide your pupils, to be sure, in regions where you are yourself a stranger. But a teacher who is pressing forward to things barely apprehended as yet and not yet attained, may be the most helpful teacher of all, through a kind of comradeship of hope and aspiration.

Even in the more external matters of good breeding, it is well for children to make a try at manners a little above their own. And we all know how good and necessary it is to keep trying at morals a little above our own. There is an illustration of such teaching as this, drawn from an old-time school in the South, which will carry my meaning more clearly than any general re-

mark that I can make. I refer to a letter of Alexander H. Stephens to Richard Malcolm Johnston, in which Mr. Stephens gave an account of a country school teacher whose pupil he had been, that teacher being Mr. Stephens' own father: "He took great pleasure in the act of teaching" — I quote here from the letter:

His scholars generally were much attached to him. He was on easy and familiar terms with them without losing their respect; and the smallest boys would approach him with confidence, but never with familiarity. He had one custom I never saw or heard of in any other school. About once a month on a Friday evening, after the spelling classes had got through their tasks, he had an exercise on ceremony, which the scholars called "learning manners," though what he called it — if I ever heard him call it anything — I cannot remember. The exercise consisted in going through the usual form of salutation on meeting an acquaintance, and introducing persons to each other, with other variations occasionally introduced. . . . These exercises, trivial as the description may seem, were of great use to raw country boys and girls. . . . Cheating, lying, and everything mean and dishonest he held up to scorn and abhorrence. He was, so far as I know, the only old-field teacher of those days on whom the boys never played the prank of "turning out."

The old-field teacher, I suppose, is now extinct. His work, and a great deal more, has fallen to the young women who graduate from our normal schools and colleges and go out to teach in a regular system of schools. Many of

them will marry after a time — and the more the better, if their hearts go with their hands. But so long as they are in the schools, they are called on to practise as fine an art as was exercised by the best of their predecessors in any age; and that art will not be lost to the world if it be carried over into the narrower and deeper education of the home. President Sharpless some years ago congratulated himself “that whether our poor children were learning their lessons or not, it was a good thing for them to come into intimate relations for several hours daily with such lady-like teachers as one often sees.”

There is one way of reaching up into a larger life that is not always easy for our lady-like teachers themselves to learn, but which they must needs learn in order that they may teach it well in their schools. I refer to the lesson of civic life, the lesson of duty to the community and to the commonwealth.

The wise woman from whom I learn much every day has been troubled to see children scattering papers and disfiguring trees and sidewalks on their way from school. And it has been her dream that some day in our schools they will really come to an understanding of their part in the general responsibility for our community life. It is easy to tell them not to do this or that. May they not come to have things to do, as well

as things to leave undone? If some little part might be given to them in making their city or town or district a better place to live, they would be started on one of the largest lessons that our whole people has to learn. I recall with peculiar pleasure the flowers planted about the public square in Scranton, Pennsylvania, by the school children of that city, and other striking examples might be mentioned.

The life of our neighborhood, of our state and nation — it is a thing for which every citizen, in his measure, is responsible: great citizens, and little citizens, too. It is one of the things that take us out of our selfish selves, and make us reach up to the destined stature of our lives. It is one of the ideas that should be at work in our schools everywhere. Here the art of the teacher comes to one of its finest and severest tests: To hitch the wagon of his little school to this star of our national life, and cause the little children of our land to begin to live for the common good.

But now this look at some large ideals of the teacher's art leads us to another characteristic of all fine art, and that is its care for proportion, its nice discrimination between things large and small. The sense for proportion is as indispensable in the school room as in the studio, for too often we waste our time on trifles. "Good taste rejects excessive nicety," as Fénelon said; "it treats little things as little things." And good

taste will save a teacher from some of the commonest sins of the teaching craft.

A teacher cannot afford to attain perfection in any part of his work, at the sacrifice of that which is better than perfection. The perfection which is attainable is too small a result for all our labor. It is not that which is carved to a finish which will satisfy us. We want for ourselves and for our children some vision of majestic, dim, unsculptured things. We want to find our studies opening up here and there a vista into some unknown country and tempting us to new adventure. The finished arch is good; but we would see through it

“That untravell’d world, whose margin fades
Forever and forever.”

There are those who would say that education, like literature, has had its “age of the carved cherry-stones,” and that our primary schools have not yet advanced beyond that age. And some would charge this over-emphasis on little things to the influence of women in the schools. But women have no monopoly of such influence. A petty man can nowhere be more petty than in a school. Matthew Arnold tried to get some bigness into the prevalent conception of God. We need, all of us, to get more bigness into our conception of education, which is surely one of the works of God.

Yet perfection in the smaller things has a part

and place of its own. I think we may fairly say that all of our instruction has, of right, these two aspects of method running through it. Here we must have our work finished with exactness and nicety; there it must be sketched in alluring outlines. Both modes of treatment are needed, but they are differently proportioned and combined in different disciplines.

Our teachers require, in fact, that same mixing of the elements in themselves that is called for in their instruction. We can be patient with the grand vagueness of a young teacher, full of crude and glowing immensities, provided he show himself able to condense some of his fire-mist into a definite and ordered system. And we can be patient with an old-time schoolmaster's fondness for system, if his system have not absorbed and cooled and hardened for him all of that primal nebula with which we may suppose him to have been once endowed. Our teacher shall have system and fire-mist, both at once. Let him show us a true cosmos, but if he have a little, wholesome, unperturbed chaos left in him, we shall like him all the better for that.

You will doubtless recall this fine combination of perfectness in little things with large suggestion of the outlying, cosmic things, as you have seen it in some of those by whom you have been taught. The artist makes the large things and the little things go together, as they belong to-

gether, but each in its own degree and place. At one time it is a matter of supreme importance that c-a-t spells *cat*, that two and two make four. At another time words and facts, grammar and history, all are subordinate things, mere helps or hindrances, while the thing of import is that a group of young people shall become aware of some great tidal sweep and uplift, as in the Ode on the Intimations of Immortality.

A class may work long, weary hours for the mastery of a lesson. Then at the end of the task the best thing, not infrequently, is reached in some hint from the teacher of the boundless range of thought upon which that little mastered lesson opens out. Yet that suggestion, too, would not have been possible, if the class had not first learned their plain and definite lesson and learned it well. So the great and the small, the definite and the vague, are intermixed, the one supporting and seconding the other, and neither the one nor the other is overdone; and there we have in the finished work a well-ordered temperateness, with all the saving grace of wide variety. Such a work is a work of art, of one of the finest of all the arts, and such a work, I doubt not, some of you will achieve.

There is nothing more useful to the maintaining of just proportions in this life than a genial sense of humor. A laugh is a dangerous thing in its way. It must needs be handled with judg-

ment. But if it carry no sting and have some genuine refinement back of it, it can do a world of good. And its chief value is that it can save us from exaggeration. The old builders put gargoyles on their cathedrals and we put cartoons into our newspapers. Once let our young teacher get so absorbed with his art that it runs away with his common sense, and the comic valentine, the ever-ready parody, or the surreptitious drawing of the school cartoonist, is likely enough to call him to himself. If he will not abuse it, the teacher, too, may wisely sprinkle a little salt of comedy upon the flat seriousness of his school. Even the forced buffoonery of the Hoosier Schoolmaster helped him over a hard passage in his hard experience. I suppose the tale has been forgotten in this present generation, and it is not good enough to repeat. But I may repeat a bit of college tradition, well known in some circles, but worth the telling even if it has been heard before. I fear it calls for scriptural knowledge which the present generation is none too sure of acquiring. The story as I have heard it is told of Professor Moses Coit Tyler, and belongs to his days in the University of Michigan. He was not always prompt to close his lecture with the end of the hour, and the boys of his class made known their disapproval by vigorous scuffling with their feet. One day the lecture was unusually prolonged and the noise of the students was unusually insistent.

Taking notice at last, the professor raised his hand in deprecation. "One moment, gentlemen," he said, "one moment"; and then he added, thoughtfully, "a few more pearls, a few more pearls!"

After I have tried my best to characterize that paragon, an artist-teacher, and find how near, at best, my description comes to a catalogue of "moral virtues and their contrary vices," I am disposed to poke a bit of fun even at this frail paper of my own. A genuine human being, though with many imperfections, is so much better than any paragon! Better, even in that center of all things good and correct which is known as a model school. Any one who has ever loved a living girl knows that half of her charm lies in the fact that he could never by any possibility have invented her himself. And no synthesis of enumerated elements can ever construct for us a live and quickening teacher.

But I shall have to answer my own gibe, and protest that this is not a paragon at all that I am setting forth and not at all a creature of my invention. It is because I have seen some genuine artists and found them teaching in real schools, that I am moved to tell what manner of work they were doing. They were artists indeed, and for that reason my account of their performance must fall far short of its vivid reality. The human quality of the work, after

all, is what I am seeking to bring before you, and it is a human impulse, I am sure, that prompts one to make such an attempt. The hope, moreover, that the account will call up in your thought the image of a human teacher, depends upon the hours that you yourselves have passed in the presence of living teachers who taught with creative power.

Now, if a sense for proportion, as has been said, is of the essence of an artist's work, a matter of equal importance and still harder to attain is the genuine artist's sense for time. If the artist is genuine, he is willing to take time in order that he may get the better of time, for he is endeavoring to do a work that shall last, in spite of all that time may do.

A spirit which is not the artist spirit is always seeking after the newest things because they are new. Maarten Maartens makes one of his characters say, "Your taste is entirely vitiated, my dear, because you have no comprehension of the beautiful out-of-date." In the same spirit Professor Jackman used to speak, with mild satire, to his class in a summer school. "You have come here," he would say, "to learn the latest fashions in the teaching of long division."

Be sure of this, that what is now the mode and only the mode will after a while be out-of-date. Whatever is new, it shall grow old. The only

things that do not grow old are the things that never were altogether new. Whoever has the spirit of a true artist seeks to do a work that shall abide. Accordingly, as regards means and methods, he cares more that they shall be true and good than that they shall be the newest of the new. You remember the lines,

“He knew to bide his time,
And can his fame abide.”

And Lincoln, of whom it was said, was one of the great teachers of the American people. Other teachers may well learn that lesson of his large and liberal patience.

It is difficult to put this matter just right, for there is a patience that is weakness and there is a haste that is timely and necessary. Dawdling and loitering never were artistic processes. In fact, true art is scrupulous as regards waste. It exercises the finest economy. But it knows, too, how to spend without stint, how to labor on, quietly and unhurriedly, as nature brings the blossom to its fruit. Even the born artist must learn that perfect way, narrower than the scimitar's edge, between the imperfection of haste and the imperfection of waste.

Studies differ in this regard. Some can best be learned under pressure, with keen questioning that calls for quick and definite answer. In some parts of arithmetic this is true, and in the more

mechanical parts of grammar and of history. But history in its finer and deeper things, literature, and the larger study of nature — these must be lived with, till they warm the soul and tinge the thought and take up their abode in the inner life. Facts are to be learned, sharply and decisively, without temporizing or dilly-dallying. But points of view, appreciations, attitudes of mind, these are gained slowly, and for these we must learn to wait. You may wait, without urging the learner at all, for a week, a month, a year, and it may be for many years. One day you shall see a new intelligence flash into the eyes, the morning of a new life has dawned, and the teacher has received his great reward.

Not only do studies differ in this regard: in almost any piece of teaching there is a time to push forward and a time to wait. From experience in the class room, I am inclined to accept the view of those psychologists who say that there are plateaus in the process of learning any new thing. That is, there are times when continued effort fails to bring continued improvement, but when, if practice be carried steadily forward, the upward movement after a little begins again. The time of arrest is found to be a preparation for further gains. It requires fine insight and not a little experience to put these plateau periods to their largest use. It may be best to turn aside to other things, to let that part of the subject lie fallow for

a while. It may be best to go forward, and let the upward trend of improvement set in again when it will. When the children of Israel came to the Red Sea, Moses said, "Stand still, and see the salvation of God." But when he laid the case before Jehovah, the answer came, "Why criest thou to me? Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward."

Now, there is one way that the question of time enters into the inmost soul of teaching. For it has to do with the personal character of the teacher himself, and that is about the most vital thing for any school. There are teachers, and you have known them well, who have power to carry their pupils with them, whatever they may do. It is a power of strong suggestion, and it may become even hypnotic in its degree. It can produce quick and striking results, for it gains an autocratic ascendancy over the pupils' minds. We have all seen the warm enthusiasm which a "magnetic" teacher can arouse. His personal attractiveness lends new life to the school. Where others must plod, he lends, as an old writer put it, "not feete, but wings."

Now, one who has such power as this, has a keen weapon which may cut for good or ill. He may use it for immeasurable good. He may arouse the sluggish, he may give new hope to those who have become discouraged, he may tide over the crisis of some lives by his inspiring influ-

ence. But, on the other hand, he may work great harm. He may attach his pupils so closely to himself as to make them dependent upon him for the incentive to all endeavor.

A test of such a teacher's work may be found in the experience of the teacher who comes after him. Have the pupils become more self-reliant, or is their strength and interest gone with the leader who galvanized them into an artificial life? The true artist in the school may have much or little of the power to awaken enthusiasm, but the best of his work abides. A great teacher, indeed, is one who leads us to think great thoughts, but the greatest teacher is the one who helps us most after he himself is gone. Jesus said to His disciples, "It is expedient for you that I go away."

But this discussion should not be prolonged. It is meant to do no more than make a small beginning on a large subject. You will soon be going out into your great and good work of teaching school. Let me bid you God-speed. When Dean Colet founded St. Paul's School in London, in the days of Henry the Eighth, he wrote these words, "I charge the maisters that they teche allways that is beste." Let us take his words for the very different work in which you are to engage — and yet it is the same; and so I charge you, young women, that you teach always things that are best.

INDEX

INDEX

[NAMES OF PERSONS ARE IN ITALICS.]

- Abbott, Mary N.*, 187.
Adams act, 52-53.
 Agricultural and mechanical colleges, establishment, 50-53.
 Agricultural education, *Adams act*, 52-53; and *Benjamin Franklin*, 49; *Columbia college*, 50; development, 45-59; early interest in, 46-47; *Hatch acts*, 52; history, 49-53; *Michigan*, 50; *Michigan state agricultural college*, 48, 50; *Moor's Indian school*, 49; *Morrill acts*, 50-52; *Nelson amendment*, 53; *Pennsylvania*, 50; training of experts, 54.
 Agricultural societies, formation, 47.
 Agriculture, first seed distribution by Government, 47.
 Alaska, introduction of reindeer, 130-131.
Alderman, E. A., on *The Growing South*, 202-203.
 Apprenticeship system, 48-49, 138.
 Arbitration, international, and the public schools, 99-109; day of special observance recommended, 99-100.
 Art, leadership of Europe, 127; moral implications, 73.
 Art of the teacher, 221-238.
 Association of practical housekeeping centers, *New York*, 177-178.
 Associations, educational. See Educational associations.
 Attendance, school, statistics, 157-159.
Ayers, L. P., on dwindling of public school classes, 159-160, footnote.
 BACKWARD CHILDREN, school, 125.
Barrett, John, on commercial relations with South America, 141.
Bell, Andrew, monitorial system, 124.
 Bureau of education. See U. S. Bureau of education.
 CARNEGIE TECHNICAL SCHOOLS, *Pittsburgh*, and apprenticeship, 138.
 Child-labor laws, 155-157.
 Children, United States, some of their needs, 147-165.
 Children's nurses, training, 171-172, 174-176, 178-179.
 Christianity, interpretation, 91-92.
 Cincinnati, University of, address delivered at, 27-41; experiment in engineering course, 138.
 Cities, government, 30; higher life, 28-30; influence of universities on, 36-41; influence on life, 35; institutional life, 33; public press, 32; public schools, 33-34; representative men, 31-33; self-respect of, 27-41.

- Colet, Dean*, on teaching, 237-238.
 Columbia college, agricultural education, 50.
 Compulsory education, 154-157.
 Conference of governors, states and territories, at Washington, D. C., 6-7.
 Congress, influence of, 3.
 Connecticut, agricultural societies, 47; public trade schools, 138.
 Consultations de nourrissons, Paris, 176-177.
 Cottage instruction, children, London, 177-178.
 Crime and education, 9.
 Curriculum, elementary schools, comparative study (Payne), 116-117.
- DEMOCRACY and education, 67-68.
 Democracy and religion, 71-72.
 Department of agriculture. *See* U. S. Department of agriculture.
 Department of superintendence. *See* National education association.
Draper, A. S., on number of teachers, 140-141.
- ÉCOLE DES MÈRES, Paris, 176.
 Education, allied with science, 63-64, 67-68; ally of religion, 71; apprenticeship system, 138; compulsory, 154-157; curriculum, elementary schools, comparative study (Payne), 116-117; elementary, influence, 8-10; elementary schools, non-sectarian, an original contribution to, 129; emergence of world-standards in school and university, 141-142; and federal government, 21; Germany, leadership, 127-128; Germany, system of higher, effect on student, 149; high schools, an original contribution to, 129; humanism, new, 114-116; industrial, a national interest, 211-217; invention in field of, 121-143; kindergarten, not assimilated in educational system, 123-124; leadership of Germany, 127-128; manual labor schools, 49-50; Massachusetts, 4; monitorial system, 124; moral, in Japan, 80-81; New England states, 4; normal schools and universities, distinctive functions in preparation of teachers, 199-206; public schools, city, 33-34; and international arbitration, 99-109; religious, public schools, 65; religious and secular, 63-73; school attendance, statistics, 157-159; Sloyd system, 125; taxation, support of schools (Webster), 4; teachers, international comity, 140-141; teachers, training, 199-206; women, higher, 139-140; women's organizations, work of, 187-195.
- Education and crime, 9.
 Education and democracy, 67-68.
 Education and the state, 9-10, 15-24.
 Educational associations, international, 140-141; possible co-operation between those of different countries, 113-118; state, co-operation, 142.
 Elementary education, influence, 8-10.
 Elementary schools, American, non-sectarian, original contribution to education, 129.
- FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, and education, 21.
Franklin, Benjamin, and agricultural education, 49.

- Froebel, F. W. A.*, 124, 223.
Fry, Mrs. Elizabeth, 188.
- GERMANY, leadership in education, 127-128; system of higher education, effect on student, 149.
- Government by influence, 3-24.
- Governors, conference of, state and territorial, at Washington, D. C., 6-7.
- HAGUE, The, International peace conference, 99.
- Hare, A. J. C.*, 188.
- Hatch acts, 52.
- Henderson, C. R.*, 176.
- High schools, American, an original contribution to education, 129.
- Higher education, German system, effect on student, 149.
- Holt, Dr. L. E.*, on training of children's nurses, 179.
- INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION, a national interest, 211-217.
- International arbitration. *See* Arbitration, international.
- International congress on the welfare of the child, address before, 147-165.
- International peace conference, at The Hague, 99, 100.
- Interparliamentary union, 113.
- Inventions, electric railway, first operated, 122; field of education, 121-143; mechanical, 122.
- JAPAN, Imperial rescript, 80-81.
- Johnston, R. M.*, 225.
- Keller, Helen*, 130.
- Kelley, Mrs. Florence*, on training for mother-work, 177-178.
- Kindergarten, not assimilated in educational system, 123-124.
- Kindergarten nurses, training, 179-180.
- LABOR, organized, and industrial education, 216.
- Lake Mohonk conference on international arbitration, address before, 99-109.
- Lancaster, Joseph*, monitorial system, 124.
- Le Conte, Joseph*, 222.
- Legislation, methods discussed, 13-17.
- Lincoln, Abraham*, 234; signing of Morrill act, 51.
- MANUAL LABOR SCHOOLS, agricultural education, 49-50.
- Massachusetts, agricultural societies, 47; education of youth, 4; public trade schools, 138.
- Michigan, agricultural education, 50.
- Michigan state agricultural college, 48, 50; address before, 45-59.
- Miele, Dr.*, 177.
- Moll-Weiss, Mme. Augusta*, 176.
- Monitorial system, success and ultimate failure, 124.
- Moral instruction, Japan, 80-81.
- Morality, culture, 77-96; and religion, 69-73.
- Morrill, Justin S.*, and endowment of agricultural and mechanical colleges, 50-52.
- Mothers' congress, 147, 160.
- Mother-work, problem of preparation, 162-165; training, 169-184.
- NATIONAL COUNCIL OF EDUCATION, addresses before, 113-118, 199-206.
- National education association, co-operation with similar bodies in

- other lands, 113, 117-118; department of national organizations of women, address before, 187-195; department of superintendence, address before, 211-217.
- National government, agricultural education, 50-53; industrial education, 214-215.
- National organizations of women, 147-148.
- Nelson amendment, 53.
- New England states, instruction of youth, 4.
- New York, agricultural societies, 47.
- Normal schools, and universities, distinctive functions of, in preparation of teachers, 199-206.
- North Carolina, University of, address delivered at, 3-24.
- Nurses, children's, training, 171-172, 174-176, 178-179; hospital, training, 172-174; kindergarten, training, 179-180.
- PATENT OFFICE. *See* U. S. Patent office.
- Payne, B. R.*, on comparative study of public elementary school curricula of the leading culture nations, 116-117.
- Peace conference, international, The Hague, 99, 100.
- Pennsylvania, agricultural education, 50; agricultural societies, 47.
- REINDEER, Alaska, introduction, 130-131.
- Religion and democracy, 71-72.
- Religion and morality, 69-73.
- Religion and science, factors in life, 66-67.
- Religious and secular education, 63-73.
- Religious education, public schools, 65.
- Religious education association, address before, 63-73, 169-184.
- SCHOOL GARDENS, 125.
- School life, overlapping with life of wage-earner and producer, 152-154.
- Science and education, 63-64, 67-68.
- Science and public service, 20-24.
- Science and religion, 66-67.
- Secondary education. *See* High schools.
- Secular and religious education, 63-73.
- Sharpless, President*, on school-teachers, 226.
- Sloyd system, 125.
- Social service and science, 20-24.
- South, the growing (Alderman), 202-203.
- South Carolina, agricultural societies, 47.
- State and education, 9-10, 15-24.
- State universities, influence, 10-11; influence on government, 19.
- Stead, W. T.*, 116.
- Stephens, A. H.*, letter to Richard Malcolm Johnston on old-field teachers, 225.
- TEACHERS, art of, 221-238; international comity, 140-141; training, 199-206.
- Thorndike, E. L.*, on dwindling of public school classes, 159.
- Trade schools, 138.
- U. S. BUREAU OF EDUCATION, 52; and agricultural education, 58-59.
- U. S. Department of agriculture, work, 52, 58.

- U. S. Patent office, 122; center of national pride, 126.
- Universities, in cities, relation to school system, 37-38; influence, 7-8, 34-37, on cities, 36-41, on government, 15-20; and normal schools, distinctive functions, in preparation of teachers, 199-206; state, influence, 10-11, on government, 15-20.
- University, American, an original contribution to education, 129.
- University extension, 125.
- University of Cincinnati, address delivered at, 27-41; experiment in engineering course, 138.
- University of North Carolina, address delivered at, 3-24.
- University of West Virginia, address delivered at, 3-24.
- VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY, address delivered at, 77-96
- Vassar college chapter of Phi Beta Kappa, address before, 121-143.
- Vocational schools, 173-174. *See also* Trade schools.
- Washington, George*, on influence, 3.
- Washington, George*, interest in farming, 46.
- Webster, Daniel*, on taxation for support of schools, 4.
- Wellesley College, address delivered at, 221-238.
- West Virginia, University of, address delivered at, 3-24.
- Winthrop normal and industrial college, Rock Hill, S. C., address delivered at, 221-238.
- Women, higher education, 139-140; organizations, national, 147-148, work in education, 187-195.

MAR 18 1810

One copy del. to Cat. Div.

1000 10 1000

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 792 920 0